

# AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

VERNON CARSTENSEN  
*Editor*



VOLUME 27  
1953

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY





# AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Volume 27



Number 1

January 1953

Foreword	<i>Edward N. Wentworth</i>	1
Everett Eugene Edwards	<i>Herbert A. Kellar</i>	2
Everett E. Edwards—Public Servant	<i>O. V. Wells</i>	18
Everett E. Edwards—Scholar and Teacher	<i>Lewis E. Atherton</i>	20
Rural Communities and the American Pattern	<i>Everett E. Edwards</i>	21
Everett E. Edwards as I Knew Him	<i>Charles A. Burmeister</i>	25
A Bibliography of the Writings of Everett Eugene Edwards	<i>Wayne D. Rasmussen and Helen H. Edwards</i>	26
Announcement of the Everett Eugene Edwards Memorial Awards		37
News Notes and Comments		38

---

Published Quarterly

by

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

---

# THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Editorial and Business Office

ROOM 3906, SOUTH AGRICULTURAL BUILDING  
U. S. BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

## *Officers and Executive Committee*

*President:* Edward N. Wentworth, Armour's Livestock Bureau, Chicago 9, Illinois  
*Vice President:* Carl C. Taylor, United States Department of Agriculture  
*Secretary-Treasurer:* Charles A. Burmeister, 4650 Broad Branch Road, Washington, D. C.  
Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri  
Walter H. Ebling, P. O. Box 351, Madison 1, Wisconsin  
Paul W. Gates, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York  
John D. Hicks, University of California, Berkeley 4, California  
Rodney C. Loehr, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota  
Joseph C. Robert, Coker College, Hartsville, South Carolina

## AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

The Quarterly Journal of the Agricultural History Society

*Agricultural History* is designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearinghouse for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included, and also materials on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development. The Society is not responsible for the statements or opinions of contributors.

All members of the Agricultural History Society receive *Agricultural History*. The memberships are: Student, \$2.00 annually for bona fide students 18-25 years old; annual, \$4.00; contributing, \$10.00; life, \$133.00, inclusive of all previous payments of dues and contributions, or a sum in U. S. dollars equivalent to 133 less the age of the applicant at his or her last birthday, exclusive of prior dues and contributions; joint membership with the Economic History Association, \$8.00; and joint membership with the Economic History Association and the Economic History Society (England), \$11.00. Single current numbers, \$1.25. Reprints, if available, 25 and 50 cents each, according to size. An annual subscription to *Agricultural History* is \$4.00 net. The editor will supply information concerning back numbers.

## *Editorial Board*

*Acting Editor:* Wayne D. Rasmussen, United States Department of Agriculture  
Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri  
Harry J. Carman, Columbia University, New York 27, New York  
Robert G. Dunbar, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana  
V. C. Fowke, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada  
G. E. Fussell, Primrose House, Fressingfield, Diss, Norfolk, England  
Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Collection, Madison, Wisconsin  
Fred Landon, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada  
Rodney C. Loehr, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota  
O. C. Stine, Twentieth Century Fund, Washington, D. C.  
Nannie M. Tilley, East Texas State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas  
Lazar Volin, United States Department of Agriculture

*Agricultural History* is published for the Agricultural History Society at the Waverly Press, Inc., Mount Royal and Guilford Avenues, Baltimore 2, Maryland.

Entered as second-class matter on October 12, 1928, at the post office of Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

r-  
st  
1,  
l-  
os  
g,  
in  
ve  
0;  
y  
c-  
ly

2.,  
d,



EVERETT EUGENE EDWARDS

## FOREWORD

The qualities of scholarship are inborn: they are as clearly a part of one's personal inheritance as any other capacity for refined performance. But just as clearly their development and exercise require favorable surroundings. Whether these surroundings prove satisfactory because they are merely protective, or whether their value lies in the challenge they offer, makes a great difference in the resulting individual. The leaders who have carried us forward the farthest are those who have met the greatest challenge and who have overcome the greatest difficulties.

Such a leader was Everett E. Edwards, to whom the Agricultural History Society dedicates this issue of its journal. His humble origins on a most tightly operated Minnesota farm provided his youthful hurdle. His expansion thereafter was the greater because he saw and accepted the challenge.

Everett's qualities were not corporeal, though he possessed physical strength in abundance. Nor were they the inspiring traits of an aggressive and consuming personality. Yet his associates found, when he burst the bounds of his innate modesty, those characteristics of an inspiring leadership that aligned them with enthusiasm to his cause. Edwards' leadership was based on his fine qualities of mind—a keen sense of honor, a spirit of profound integrity, and the hot tempering flame of a zeal for knowledge plus a lifetime pursuit of verity. Like Hamlet, he could say, "If circumstances lead me, I will find where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed within the center."

With full credit to the initiative and contributions of the founders of the Agricultural History Society its effectuation, achievements, and nature were the result of Edwards' quarter-century of personal toil and sacrifice. Few of his associates realized how quickly the flame of life would flicker and snuff out, as the end of his day approached. With the rush of daily living about us, we—his associates—put off until tomorrow that expression of appreciation which we should have uttered yesterday. This tardy tribute is to one of America's most faithful historians—a tribute our membership will ever regret it did not pay when the score was due.

EDWARD N. WENTWORTH, *President*  
*Agricultural History Society*

## EVERETT EUGENE EDWARDS

HERBERT A. KELLAR

*Coordinator of the McCormick Collection, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin*

Everett Eugene Edwards, son of Edward E. and Jennie Hunt Edwards, was born on a farm near Waltham, Minnesota, February 12, 1900, and grew up as a farm boy in a rural community.

The Edwards family, whose prevailing ancestral stock was English on both sides, had engaged in agricultural pursuits, as a way of life, for a number of generations. One of Everett's paternal great-grandfathers, George Johnson, was born in Leicestershire, England and lived upon a farm which had been in family possession for 200 years. He married Dorothy Bailey in 1847. Dorothy Johnson, the oldest child of this marriage, came with her father and mother to New York State in 1852, where they settled at Coldon in Erie County. Eighteen months later, the family moved to Newton, Marquette County, Wisconsin, and after residing there for a few years, went to Waltham Township, Mower County, Minnesota, in 1862. George Johnson arrived in Minnesota in an ox-drawn covered wagon and brought with him cattle and sheep, and a small amount of capital. His first purchase was 80 acres of land, added to in later years, until at the time of his death in 1872 his holdings were 680 acres. His widow survived him until 1892. Dorothy Johnson married Milton H. Edwards. Their only child was George Albert. Because of the death of both of his parents while he was still a child, George Albert Edwards was raised by his grandmother, Dorothy Bailey Johnson, who changed his name to Edward E. Edwards.

On the maternal side, Everett's great-grandfather was Hiram Hunt, who was born in 1809 and died January 11, 1895. His great-grandmother was Cornelia Hall Hunt, who was born in 1806 and died in 1892. Everett's grandfather, Eugene Franklin Hunt, was born in Pinkney, Lewis County, New York in 1839, and subsequently moved with his parents to Beaver Dam, Wisconsin. Eugene Franklin Hunt married Mary C. Kezar at Waupan, Wisconsin in 1864 and six years afterward settled in Waltham Township in Minnesota. Jennie Hunt, the fourth child of Eugene Franklin and Mary Hunt, was born in Waltham Township and married Edward E. Edwards. Everett Eugene

Edwards was their oldest child. A brother and sister died in infancy. Everett's mother and Wesley Edwards, the youngest child, still survive. His father died in 1945.

The Hunt family, which originally came from England, took an active part in the American Revolution, fighting for the Colonists against the British. The Battle of Saratoga was partly waged on a Hunt family farm. Another ancestor, Lyman Hall, was a planter in Georgia, and one of the five physicians who signed the Declaration of Independence. Everett recalled on occasion Sunday dinners with his grandparents where those present were regaled with stories of Indian raids, a subject undoubtedly suggested by family experiences.<sup>1</sup>

The Edwards farm in Waltham Township upon which Everett spent the earlier part of his life, consisted of 200 acres of black prairie soil and was operated as a diversified unit. The principal capital equipment, in addition to the land, which included a timber tract, were a house, barn, granary, windmill, fences, farm implements and machines, several wagons, sleds, and a carriage. The livestock customarily consisted of eight horses, 12 to 20 cows, and a number of pigs, chickens, turkeys, ducks, and geese. A small herd of sheep was maintained and also an orchard.

Other farms of a similar type were nearby and some of these were occupied by relatives. Everett's family and their connections took great pride in their English inheritance and were reserved in contacts with people in the neighborhood who were of other nationalities.

In the early 1900s, life in Waltham Township had already pressed beyond the pioneer period, yet many primitive conditions of rural civilization still obtained. Numerous activities of the inhabitants continued to be dominated by a horse power era, although there were clear indications of changes to

<sup>1</sup> Letters and enclosures, Helen Edwards to Herbert A. Kellar, June 23, Nov. 18, 1952, Mar. 17, 1953. Wesley Edwards, "Everett E. Edwards, Biographical Notes on Early Years," typewritten copy Nov. 17, 1952; letter, Lela M. Ronken, Rochester, Minn. to H. A. Kellar, Feb. 20, 1953.



come, with the internal combustion engine, the Model T Ford, the truck, and the tractor rapidly advancing upon the local scene and about to revolutionize the economic and social life of the community. This change was in common with that of many other localities of like circumstance, throughout this broad land.

The Edwards farm was reasonably close to several towns. Waltham and Sargeant were each two and one half miles distant; Brownsdale was five miles away; Austin, the county seat, was fifteen miles from the farm. Visits were made, at intervals, to each of these towns, where at the general stores, eggs and other produce were exchanged for shoes, apparel, and some types of groceries. Such visits were regarded as events of note. Journeys to the county seat were limited to occasions such as county fairs, or the appearance of a Buffalo Bill circus.

Work upon the farm was varied, constant, hard, and never ending. Everyone participated in daily tasks in one form or another. Field crops were principally timothy, clover, oats, rye, corn, and wheat. Manure spreaders aided in fertilizing the soil upon which produce was to be raised. Oliver sulkey and John Deere gang plows were used to turn the earth. The subsequent operation of disc and drag harrows to smooth the ground necessitated much walking behind them. Mechanical seeders were advantageous to plant the several crops as compared with the former practice of the single or double broadcast of seed by hand. Similarly, cultivation of corn with the cultivator plows available at the time was a great improvement over a man using a hoe. Under unfavorable conditions, clearing away the weeds between the rows was still an arduous proceeding. The Edwards' boys thought that the proper handling of the corn binder required considerable skill. The harvesting of timothy, clover, or grass involved the use of hay mowers, side delivery rakes, slings, and wagons. In reaping cereal grains, driving an eight-foot McCormick-Deering twine binder had its moments in creating a feeling of power on a straight away course, but there were always corners to be turned at the ends of the field. Threshing in the days of the custom rig, which visited the farm in the summer and fall, the proprietor bringing with him a huge portable steam engine and a separator, was satisfactory as to result but this was paid for in terms of excessive exposure to choking clouds of dust and chaff, and frequently debilitating heat. Also the feeding of the attending crew and other

temporary help entailed extra labor for the women of the household and of the neighborhood, who spent long hours bending over hot stoves, to satisfy the huge appetites of the husky crew. Horses were used in operating machines throughout; in the instance of threshing, to transport wood or coal and water for the engine and to convey bundles of sheaves to the thresher. Later the grain was hauled by wagon to barn and market. The care of horses, the harnessing and unharnessing of them, as well as riding and driving these animals were assigned to the boys in the family as soon as they were strong enough to assume such responsibilities.

Members of farm families, who depended upon mechanical devices to operate their farms, in time became thoroughly familiar with various types of machinery and eventually developed a mechanical sense or "know how" which enabled them to make repairs at home or replace broken parts with new ones. It was this feeling for mechanical things that acted as a potent factor in stimulating the rapid adoption of numerous inventions in this country.

In this process of mechanical evolution the Edwards clan differed from many of the more progressive farm families and participated only in part. Although accustomed to handling farm machines, appreciative of their value, and adept in their operation and use, a natural conservatism prevented the purchase of these devices until they had been tried out at length and generally accepted by the public as practical. At no time did they display enthusiasm to share the trials and tribulations of the inventor or manufacturer while a machine was in the formative or experimental stage.

Farm animals necessitated additional chores. All the livestock had to be fed at regular intervals, and in the instance of horses, cattle, and sheep, grazing had to be carefully directed and controlled. Milking, which had to be done twice daily, was one of the most confining operations upon the farm. When the days grew short, kerosene lanterns provided light for milking and other chores. Once the whole milk was obtained, the cream was separated and marketed. The skim milk provided a principal food for pigs. These when butchered furnished home meats, pork, ham, and sausage. Wool and meat were obtained from sheep and the lambs offered a readily salable cash item.

Illness or injury among men or beasts was a reoccurring problem. Much skill was developed at home in handling minor ailments, but occasionally

it was necessary to call in a country doctor for the family or a veterinarian for the animals. Birth among the livestock was always accompanied by anxiety, for stock was valuable and casualties were to be avoided if this could be done. When the event happened at night it frequently entailed long hours of sitting up with an animal, aiding nature as far as this was possible, and attempting to relieve suffering.

All fowls required considerable care. The eggs secured from the chickens, Bourbon red turkeys, which were the favored variety, ducks, and geese were excellent articles for trading, as were the birds themselves. They also added to the food supply at home.

Among the tree fruits, the apples were the most productive crop. In the vegetable garden, a necessary adjunct to every farm, potatoes, peas, beans, cabbages, and greens grew abundantly. Pumpkins flourished but watermelons would not develop. Experiments were tried with some success with the small fruits: strawberries, raspberries, and blackberries.

Life on the Edwards farm was regarded seriously and frugality was expected of everyone. "The family was religious in the sense that they had great respect for the teachings of the Bible, believed in life after death and the importance of strict observance of funeral rites and had a profound belief in God." While they "adhered rigidly to the moral standards that were a part of the tenets of the neighboring churches" they "were not members of any church." No field work was permitted on Sunday. No liquor was served at any time and there was no smoking on the farm. The practice of taking lunches out to the fields at 10:00 a. m. and at 3:00 p. m., customary on some farms, was not followed on the Edwards' place. Amusements were strictly limited. There was no swimming hole and participation of the younger generation in local baseball, football, and basketball games was unknown. The activities of 4-H clubs were just beginning.<sup>2</sup>

Mail order houses, offering lower prices for goods, were patronized when this seemed desirable, much to the annoyance of the general storekeepers, who also acted as local postmasters. The widespread rural suspicion of that day of bankers, railroads, commodity markets, farm equipment manufacturers, and big business generally was shared by

the older members of the Edwards' family and they often expressed themselves vigorously on these subjects. The opinion was held that items which were bought cost too much, whereas sales of livestock and cereal grains brought in too little. Indicative of this attitude a boy accompanied his father to market with a load of grain, cattle, or hogs in order to watch the scales when weights were ascertained. One could tell the success or failure of a trip to market by the way a farmer drove home on the high, raised seat of his wagon.

The party line telephone offered some communication with neighbors. It was a great day in 1916 when a Model T Ford, with a brass radiator and lights operated with acetylene gas, was purchased, but it was always used with conservatism. The advent of the tractor was opposed to the last ditch. It was believed that you could not raise the feed to run a tractor.

The Edwards family took several farm periodicals. The Meredith publication, *Successful Farming*, came regularly. Subsequently, *The Farmer, Capper's Weekly*, and other agricultural guides appeared on the family table. First a weekly, then a daily newspaper, the *Austin Herald*, provided news of the locality, county, state, and nation.

On the Edwards farm the pioneer philosophy of "make it for yourself or otherwise do without" was prevalent at all times. This stimulated self reliance but did not add to ease or comfort of existence. The rigor of life, exacting in the early years of the nineteenth century, continued in the twenties to be stern and demanding, complete with hard work.

In after years, Everett recalled his early life on the farm as chiefly consisting of "work, work, work, and scrimp, and save." The stories he told of incidents in this period would seem to bear this out. He was always a great worker then and later. A boy who could hold his own as a member of a team in the strenuous activity on a "bundle wagon," in threshing time was credited with being a man. Everett had qualified in this respect at the age of 14 or 15. His father later boasted that his son could do a man's work while in his early teens. Everett was skilled in the operation of the farm equipment. The manipulation of the side delivery hay rake was the farming chore he enjoyed the most. He excelled in gardening and was proud of his ability to grow unusual vegetables and fruits, particularly those that were difficult to raise in that climate. His reputation for gardening was known and recognized in the community.

<sup>2</sup> Letter, Helen Edwards to H. A. Kellar, Mar. 17, 1953.



As a hand goes into a glove, Everett fitted into the life on the Edwards' farm in his earlier years, and he was instilled with a deep love of the land and a deep interest in all phases of farm operation and agriculture that dominated his interests throughout his life. Yet he resented the unending toil and the dull, demanding routine of chores that allowed no time for recreation or other pursuits, and with the advent of advanced schooling he withdrew more and more from the farm. Nevertheless in the period while he was away from home obtaining his education, and until about 1924, he returned home for at least a portion of each summer to work there. Eventually he severed his connection with the home place entirely, with the exception of paying short visits to see his father and mother, whom he must have loved dearly and for whom, as they grew older he felt a certain sense of responsibility. Incidentally his withdrawal from the farm met with the approval of both of his parents.<sup>3</sup>

The brighter side of Edwards' life came with his schooling. Spelling bees, socials, Christmas activities, and picnics at the end of the sessions were significant highlights of any elementary school year. An intelligent, wide awake student (he completed the eight-year course of the grade school in five years), the events of the day in the country school balanced themselves with weeks of routine on the farm. School was likewise the center of whatever community life existed in the neighborhood. Everett's accomplishments in his school activities were noted by his teachers, and Mr. and Mrs. Edwards were proud of his scholastic career. The family farm was located one and one-half miles from a one-room public school, which young Edwards in company with four or five other students, attended first. There was a better grade school at Brownsdale and at some sacrifice Everett's parents sent him there for the latter part of his elementary education. In the fall of 1913, he started at the Brownsdale High School, which had only the first two years of a four year course. Lela M. Larson who was one of his teachers at Brownsdale at that time recently wrote of him: "I recall

Everett as a very small yet chubby lad who must have been only about twelve years old when he entered High School. At least so it now seems to be, because he was the only boy in our High School who wore knee pants! He was very studious and very thorough in all the work assigned him. I seem to remember especially his neat fine handwriting—more like a little girl's. He was rather quiet and retiring, yet there was a twinkle in his eye and funny things that were said or done were not lost on him. I can still see him trying to suppress a smile when someone reciting was clearly bluffing and missing the mark.

"His parents at that time lived on a farm so Everett brought his own lunch and stayed around school at that hour. He would watch the other boys in their ball games and other outdoor sports, but seldom took any active part."<sup>4</sup>

To reach Brownsdale, Everett rode horseback for five miles or drove a horse and a buggy or a sled. When he had finished his studies at Brownsdale arrangements were made to send him to board with an uncle and aunt named Johnson,<sup>5</sup> in Northfield, and his high school work was completed there. This Johnson family had five children and there was another uncle—Sargeant<sup>6</sup>—in town who also had a large family. Edwards enjoyed a happy life with these two families and his cousins were like brothers and sisters to him. Willard Sargeant, one of these cousins in Northfield, wrote of this time, "Our families (Edwards and Sargeant) visited back and forth frequently and were very close." Everett and his cousin spent leisure moments together. "We used to roam the woods and swim and fish a lot on the farm belonging to my parents about four and one-half miles east of Sargeant." Willard further commented "Everett was rather shy and reserved as a boy and was very much interested in the homes and habits of birds and animals. In the winter we used to pore over the pages of an old natural history book which my mother had bought for the family. In later days Everett spent a great deal of time taking pictures of the beauty spots and historic battlefields and

<sup>3</sup> Details about life on the Edwards farm have been furnished by Agnes Larson of Northfield, Minn. and Willard Sargeant of East Dubuque, Ill.; Mrs. Lela M. Ronken of Rochester, Minn.; and Helen and Wesley Edwards. The author wishes to acknowledge indebtedness for information and critical comment to those mentioned above as well as to Wayne D. Rasmussen and Lucile Kellar.

<sup>4</sup> For data on Everett's early education see letter, Helen Edwards to H. A. Kellar, Nov. 18, 1952; Wesley Edwards, "Biographical Notes . . .," Nov. 17, 1952; letters, Lela M. Ronken to H. A. Kellar, Jan. 9 and 29, 1953.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Bailey and Jennie Levina Johnson.

<sup>6</sup> Harry A. Sargeant, whose wife was Anna Lucy Sargeant.

momuments which he visited."<sup>7</sup> Willard and Everett frequently visited back and forth in later years.

Everett continued to be proficient in his studies, particularly history and English, but he did not like mathematics, notably plane geometry. After finishing Northfield High School, he entered Carleton College in the same city in 1917. At Carleton, a scrapbook which has been preserved indicates a considerable interest in college activities, but there is little evidence of much active participation in them. Among the items resurrected from Everett's days at Carleton are Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. party programs; football, baseball, and basketball schedules; and programs of college dramatics. Curiously enough there are also many clippings of pictures of prominent public figures, who were featured in the news during the time of his college years. Everett lived in a Carleton dormitory and apparently enjoyed his life there. He entered the Army during World War I on October 10, 1918, remained two months, and was discharged on December 10, 1918. This was in his sophomore year.<sup>8</sup>

At Carleton, young Edwards did well with his studies, graduating there with an A. B. degree in 1921. Immediately afterwards he taught in the high school at Grand Rapids, Minnesota for the period 1921-22.<sup>9</sup>

The years at Carleton had developed Everett's knowledge and widened his outlook on life. The experience at Grand Rapids had further developed his thinking and given him a measure of confidence in his own abilities. An ambition to make the most of these sent him to Harvard to complete his education, and he took an A. M. there in 1924. He continued as opportunity offered to take graduate courses in this university as late as 1927.<sup>10</sup> At Harvard, although still shy and im-

mature in his thinking, he found a congenial atmosphere among graduate students and faculty and began to emerge as an individual. Fulmer Mood, Gerald S. Graham, and Thomas A. Brady were taking work at Cambridge at this time. Becoming acquainted with these young men in the Graduate School, he engaged in long conversations with them about their studies, members of the faculty, and life in general. As a result they became his good friends and he continued his close association with them in later years. The two members of the faculty who interested Everett the most were Frederick Jackson Turner and Frederick Merk. Each of these contributed greatly to his intellectual development. When Everett left Harvard he had become a mature person, liberal in his viewpoint toward life, sound in scholarly knowledge, convinced of his talents, but still conservative in his personal conduct.<sup>11</sup>

Everett accepted an instructorship in history at Northwestern University in 1923 and remained there two years. This last sojourn he came to regard later as a mistake. While the quality of his historical work at Northwestern was appreciated by faculty and students, and he made friends among both, on the whole he was unhappy in Evanston, due possibly to the atmosphere of religious conservatism which dominated the campus and city at this time. A liberal in temperament he did not subscribe in full to the prevailing thought of the community and likewise deprecated the extent of the orthodox religious influence on the university.<sup>12</sup>

At the end of two years he was glad to be able to return to Harvard in the fall of 1925 for another two years of study. He spent the summer of 1926 teaching history at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. Everett embraced with eagerness an appointment in the United States Department of Agriculture at Washington, D. C., where, in July 1927, he became a member of the staff of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This move further delighted him because it offered definite opportunity to work in the field of agricultural

Meier Schlesinger, William Scott Ferguson, Roger Bigelow Merriman, and Worthington Chauncey Ford," letter, Hazel A. Smyth, Registrar, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., to H. A. Kellar, Feb. 24, 1953.

<sup>11</sup> Information about Edwards' experiences at Harvard have been obtained from Helen Edwards and in conversations of the writer with Everett.

<sup>12</sup> Everett talked with the writer several times about his stay at Northwestern University.

<sup>7</sup> Letter, Willard Sargeant to H. A. Kellar, January 18, 1953.

<sup>8</sup> Letter, Helen Edwards, to H. A. Kellar, Nov. 18, 1952.

<sup>9</sup> *Who's Who in America, 1952-1953*, p. 719.

<sup>10</sup> "Everett Edwards took work in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University during the Academic years, 1922-23, 1925-26, 1926-27. He received a Master of Arts degree in History in 1924. While at Harvard he had courses with Abbott Payson Usher, Wilbur Cortez Abbott, Frederick Jackson Turner, Frederick Merk, Archibald Cary Coolidge, Edward Channing, Charles Homer Haskins, Charles Howard McIlwain, Samuel Eliot Morison, Arthur

history, to which by now he had resolved to devote his future allegiance and his talents.

His connection with the Department of Agriculture from 1927 to 1952, was a period of peak intellectual and physical vigor, in the course of which Everett made distinguished and enduring contributions to knowledge in his chosen field.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the most notable characteristics of these years were the variety of the enterprises in which he engaged, the concentrated and persistent industry with which for nearly a quarter of a century he applied himself to them, the surprising number of the resulting products, and their uniformly high quality in originality, execution, and character. Whether functioning as a teacher, editor, bibliographer, writer, or correspondent, Everett created and lived up to exacting criterions of scholarship. The fact that in all of these undertakings there were accompanying ideals of personal conduct and a democratic and humanitarian outlook toward life made him a well rounded and worthwhile individual for the society in which he lived. Such flaws or eccentricities of personality which he evidenced, and who does not, only served to offset in sharp relief his finer qualities.

Edwards liked to teach and was an excellent instructor, particularly of graduate and advanced students, who admired his broad knowledge, incisive thinking, and powers of analysis and interpretation. Likewise they deeply respected his standards for historical work, and the sincerity of his personal interest in them, his evident desire to increase and develop their knowledge, and the generous use he gave them of his time. Frequently, these attributes brought about lasting friendships between teacher and student.

Everett had opportunity while in the Department of Agriculture to instruct students. Early in his career there he began to offer courses in Agricultural History in the Graduate School which has been sponsored by the Department since 1921. These courses were well attended and later he also gave similar instruction at American University. In the summer of 1936 he gave lecture courses and seminars in agricultural history at the Catholic University of America and in the summer of 1939 at the University of Missouri. His last teaching outside of the District of Columbia was at the University of Minnesota in the summer of 1947. Members of Edwards' classes included colleagues connected with the Department of Agriculture,

students of universities located in the Capital City, individuals attached to other divisions of the Federal government and those doing special research in the Library of Congress or elsewhere in the community. Occasionally, and more often as his reputation grew, these were supplemented by scholars who came to the Capital particularly to take work with Edwards or to obtain information and advice from him. An indication of the breadth and depth of scope of his teaching in agricultural history can be gained from a perusal of the several syllabi for his courses which he published from time to time.

Throughout his years in Washington, Everett usually had one or two graduate or advanced students doing research under his personal direction. Often these had a part time or tenuous connection with the Department or with some other institution in the city. When their official work was completed, which might take several years, these students usually went on their way and were then replaced by others. In each instance these young scholars departed wiser and more mature in their thinking because of their contacts with Edwards.<sup>14</sup>

Edwards' influence upon others, through his teaching and imparting information about agricultural history and in inspiring students and scholars to do research and writing and to offer instruction in this field, cannot be overemphasized. This influence was exerted both through direct contact and also indirectly through the impact of his ideas which students and associates passed on to others who did not know Edwards personally. It is difficult if not impossible to estimate exactly the number of individuals who came within the scope of the influence of his teaching—but certainly several thousand at least.

<sup>14</sup> Among scholars who worked with Everett in Washington, D. C., or were associated with him there professionally at one time or another, the following may be cited: M. L. Wilson, Oscar C. Stine, Lewis C. Gray, O. E. Baker, Henry C. Taylor, Arthur G. Peterson, Nils A. Olsen, Frederick L. Lewton, Lewis Ather-ton, Paul Wallace Gates, Rodney C. Loehr, Wendell H. Stephenson, Russell H. Anderson, Guy A. Lee, Harold E. Briggs, Horace H. Russell, Edith J. Lowe, Anne C. Chew, Helen L. Eddy, and Albert V. House. Equally included in the group were Lois Olson, James P. Cavin, Walter Borg, Arthur C. Churchill, Robert G. Dunbar, Richard Osborn Cummings, David M. Ellis, LaWanda F. Cox, Kathleen Bruce, Nannie M. Tilley, Carlyle Beyer, Fulmer Mood, Hyman Howard Goldin, George Lemmer, Thomas J. Mayock, and Wayne D. Rasmusen.

<sup>13</sup> *Who's Who in America, 1952-1953*, p. 719.



Possibly the most outstanding contribution which Edwards made to the study of rural development in this and other countries was his long editorship of the *Journal, Agricultural History*.

Just prior to the turn of the century and continuing beyond World War I, there had been a gradual broadening of the horizon of interest of professional historians, which had not as yet sufficiently enlarged to embrace a separate study of our agricultural evolution and its relation to civilization in general.

In the years immediately preceding the War, a small number of individuals, geographically dispersed in the United States and studying widely divergent aspects of the rural scene, more or less independently, came to the realization that from earliest colonial days until as late as 1880, at least four-fifths of the population of this country had been directly, or indirectly connected with agriculture and dependent upon it for livelihood. Up to then, historians had generally concerned themselves almost exclusively with the interests and activities of the 20 percent and very little or not at all with those of the 80 percent. This discrepancy revealed the need for an intensive study of our agricultural development and its contributions to all of the population with a corresponding recognition of these things in historical appraisals of men, institutions, and events, as well as the evolution of localities, states, regions, and the nation. A growing cognizance of this situation normally would have promoted the formation of a national organization devoted to agricultural history somewhat sooner than was actually the case. As it happened, the War intervened and the Agricultural History Society did not become an entity until February 1919. Everett Edwards was among those who nursed and guided the infant Society in its first decade.<sup>15</sup> Although his interest did not begin until 1927 when he went to the Department

of Agriculture, it became immediately lively, effective, and continuing.

Largely through the understanding and interest of J. Franklin Jameson, the Council of the American Historical Association agreed to allow the new Society to hold joint meetings with the older Association, and further, until such time as the younger organization could handle the undertaking alone, to publish *Agricultural History Society* proceedings and papers in the *Reports of the American Historical Association*. Three slender volumes of the records of the Society subsequently appeared in this form between 1921 and 1925.<sup>16</sup>

In January 1927 the Agricultural History Society under the able editorship of O. C. Stine began a quarterly publication of its own, entitled *Agricultural History*. Everett Edwards assisted in the editing and publication of this periodical beginning with the fall issue of 1927, and in 1931 became the editor, a post in which he continued until 1952. Edwards regarded his varied responsibilities as an editor seriously and consistently gave to the periodical the utmost in service. In his case this meant not only expenditure of the time and attention which one might legitimately expect, but beyond that a passionate devotion which brooked

no bibliographer, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; William Joseph Trimble, Louis Bernard Schmidt and Earle D. Ross, historians; and Joseph Schafer of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Cooperating with the above were: C. A. Browne, agricultural chemist; W. A. Taylor, pomologist; B. T. Galloway, G. N. Collins, and G. K. Holmes, botanists; T. C. Corbett, horticulturist; R. W. Kelsey, W. Freeman Galpin, Archer B. Hulbert, W. L. Westermann, and A. H. Sanford, historians; F. D. Farrell, President of the Kansas State Agricultural College; Earl G. Swen and Marjorie Fleming Warner, librarians; Ellen Churchill Semple, historical geographer; and Carl R. Woodward of Rutgers University. Also much interested and particularly in the activities of the Society were Henry C. Taylor and Nils A. Olsen, Chiefs of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan, Avery O. Craven of the University of Chicago, E. Merton Coulter of the University of Georgia, Edward Everett Dale of the University of Oklahoma and Solon J. Buck, of the Minnesota Historical Society, historians; and the writer, representing the McCormick Historical Association.

<sup>16</sup> The writer was one of the representatives of the Agricultural History Society who conferred with Dr. Jameson about the proposed relation of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association.

<sup>15</sup> Others included were Rodney H. True, the botanist; A. C. True of Agricultural Experiment Station fame; Lyman Carrier, plant pathologist and author of *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America*; Oscar C. Stine, agricultural economist, and head of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research; Frederick L. Lewton, of the Smithsonian Institution; Lewis C. Gray, who wrote the *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*; and Percy W. Bidwell and J. I. Falconer, who prepared a similar treatise on the *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*; Claribel R. Barnett, Librarian of the Department of Agriculture; Mary G. Lacy, librarian and

no restraint in hours of work or took thought of danger to personal health because of excessive and prolonged labor.

Defraying of the cost of *Agricultural History* came chiefly from the dues of the Society, although in later years income from sales of back files supplemented whatever amount was available. The membership of the Agricultural History Society was not large, at no time exceeding five hundred, and, its income was correspondingly limited. Aware of this situation and determined that the periodical should continue, Edwards early adopted the policy of paying for each issue as he went along. A first consideration therefore was to plan in advance the allotment of pages for a single issue. If the Society was prosperous the journal, up to a certain maximum, could have a large number of pages. If the treasury was lean, a lesser number was planned. In practice, the size of an issue usually ranged from 36 to 64 pages. Excellent cooperation of the printers, the Waverly Press of Baltimore, made such an arrangement possible.

Articles were obtained in several ways: the papers read at sessions of the Agricultural History and other learned societies, which dealt with agricultural history, some solicited on definite subjects by the editor, and those sent in by authors seeking a means of publication. Occasionally, the editor contributed articles on his own account. Edwards disliked turning down an author even if his contribution was not up to standard for publication in the journal. Imagination, understanding, vision, and discrimination were displayed in the appraisal and acceptance of materials for *Agricultural History*. Papers which provided new and needed information upon a given subject or revealed previously known facts in the light of newly revealed records aroused his interest, as did summaries and analyses of the work of individuals, suggestions as to fields and subjects for further research, and studies which pointed out old and new trends of thought and action. Discussions establishing relationship between various separate branches of knowledge and the contributions of these branches to the development of agriculture, Edwards found intriguing, and he encouraged researches which delved into the records of the local, state, regional, national, and international scene, and welcomed with a view to publication the results of investigations which presented significant statistical or bibliographical data. Edwards' judgment in taking papers was very good. In the early years

it had been difficult to secure a sufficient number of articles of high standard to fill the needs of the periodical. Later he was able to accumulate a considerable backlog. In 1951 he had sixty articles on hand available for future numbers of *Agricultural History*.

Beginning with 1935 *Agricultural History* had a well selected and representative editorial board, but in practice Edwards made only occasional use of the talents of these individuals, preferring to solve his own editorial problems.

After the articles chosen were in the possession of the editor, it was necessary to evaluate each text, to check carefully for accuracy each footnote cited, and to learn whether the statements in the narrative were sustained by the information contained in the footnotes. Usual details of editing were next in order. The arrangement and form of presentation of the subject material, clearness and simplicity of the wording, and literary style, all had to be taken into consideration. Not infrequently articles had to be returned to an author for full or partial rewriting, supplementing of the text, correction of footnotes, and like changes. Other material, such as documents, news notes, and comments, likewise had to be prepared. Edwards' contributions in the form of editorials, news, and comments, go back to the issues when he was assisting O. C. Stine with the editing and in total over the years are more than 200 items. There were also occasional book reviews, which were obtained from other scholars or written by the editor. Limitations of money and space consistently restricted the editor from publishing reviews and other material to the extent which he desired.

The layout of the issue, the reading and checking of galley and page proof, decisions about paper, type, and binding, the number of copies to be ordered, and finally the mailing and distribution were all details that the editor must handle. In part, final decision on some of these matters was governed by financial considerations.

Edwards always sought to maintain a sufficient stock pile to fill requests for back numbers or entire sets of *Agricultural History*. Thus, the usual printing was about 1,000 copies. The editor arranged for reprints of separate articles for the use of authors, and annually prepared an index for the volume published in the preceding year. Each volume consisted of four issues or numbers.

As the cost of printing and publication mounted through the 1940s, and there was no comparable

increase in the amount of money received from the society, Edwards was confronted with the necessity of holding down the cost of the magazine. To do this he changed the format, narrowed the margins of the pages, and used a double column arrangement with a smaller form of type than used hitherto, but which reproduced clearly and was quite legible. This enabled him to print a larger number of articles in each issue.

Edwards was meticulous in his editing and usually attended to most of the details himself, although when assistants were available, he allowed others to do some of the preliminary tasks. There were two reasons for this: first, adequate assistance to do this work was lacking much of the time; and, second, he did not trust anyone else to do it as carefully as he would do it himself.

At intervals, *Agricultural History* contained important treatises regarding agriculture in foreign countries since Edwards wanted the magazine to deal with agricultural evolution in other parts of the world as well as progress in this country. Some of these were written by individuals here. Others were contributed by foreign scholars. G. E. Fussell of Fressingfield, England, and formerly an official of the British government, has been one of the best of the foreign contributors.

The significance of the essays selected by Edwards for publication in *Agricultural History* and the consistently high level of the editing in time gave the journal an international reputation as being one of the best edited and most valuable of the learned periodicals. This praise, in which the authors properly shared, undoubtedly was due to Edwards' services.

There was no official agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural History Society regarding Edwards' services to the journal. The head of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research, O. C. Stine, long Edwards' administrative superior in the Department of Agriculture, directed Edwards to give as much of his time as necessary to the journal. The Division also provided stenographic and editorial help, although there were times when such help was not available. Thus, from the middle of 1947 to 1952 Everett had no editorial assistance. I recall his telling me at one time that for a period of six weeks, he had had no help of any kind and was obliged to do everything himself. The editing of the magazine, as carried on by Edwards, was a full time job. His solution was to take complete responsibility and to sit up far into the night to finish

whatever it was necessary to do. In view of Edwards' abilities this action produced a journal of fine quality, but was hard on his physical strength and general health.

Of the 102 numbers of *Agricultural History* which have appeared up to this writing, covering the years 1927-1952, O. C. Stine carried the initial responsibility as editor for the first four years. Everett did some of the editorial work commencing with 1927, and more and more of it as 1931 approached. Beginning with that year and continuing until October 1951, he prepared, had printed, published, and distributed, 84 consecutive issues of *Agricultural History*.

Following Everett's illness in July 1951, he continued to hold the title of Editor until May 1952, but much of the actual work on the journal during this period was done by Wayne D. Rasmussen, who had been in the history section for a number of years. Edwards' services to *Agricultural History* after his illness became serious were largely confined to planning future numbers and giving Rasmussen expert advice and counsel.<sup>17</sup>

In addition to his teaching and the editing of *Agricultural History*, the preparation and publishing of bibliographies constituted a third major interest of Everett Edwards. These compilations, 118 in number, ranging in length from a few pages to several hundred pages, fall into five categories.

*General Bibliographies of the History of Agriculture of the United States and Other Countries.* Edwards' outstanding achievement in producing this type of reference work is indicated in *A Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States*, first printed in 1930. This publication, the most comprehensive of its kind relating to American agriculture, quickly won renown for Everett as a scholar and bibliographer and he was subsequently awarded for this work the Fourth Biennial Prize granted by the Eunice Rockwood Oberly Memorial Fund. In breadth of conception of the subject as a whole and fineness of execution of detail, this bibliography left little for the reader to desire.

Edwards was greatly disappointed in the way his publication came from the press. As originally assembled he had included critical and constructive comment concerning each of the items selected for

<sup>17</sup> Wayne D. Rasmussen has prepared and published the four issues of *Agricultural History* January to October 1952, but these were not undertaken until after May 1952.



inclusion in the bibliography with a view to making available a portion of his extensive knowledge of the subject for those who might desire to do research, teach, and write in the field of agricultural history. Officials of the Government Printing Office on viewing the manuscript promptly eliminated these comments on the ground that it was against public policy for an official of the Federal Government to discriminate in any way between the writings of its own citizens or those of other countries and although urged, subsequently refused to reinstate the aforesaid comments. Everett felt that from the point of scholarship the enforcement of this government ruling reduced the potential value of his bibliographical contributions. Notwithstanding the soundness of his position in this matter, the *Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States* sold widely and at one period was a best seller among governmental scholarly publications of its type.

Edwards wanted later to enlarge and republish his *Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States* and to provide an expanding basis for this, established a Bibliographical Index. However, the materials assembled grew so voluminous that the project never reached consummation. Eventually the Index became an enterprise in itself and as such will be discussed later. However, from time to time, Everett compiled revisions of portions of the 1930 *Bibliography*. Revealing a broad conception of his theme, he also prepared a notable bibliography designated as: *Selected References on the History of English Agriculture*, which represented a portion of a larger unpublished compilation.

A year after the appearance of the English bibliography he produced: *References on Economic History as a Field of Research and Study*, which recognized the close relationship between agricultural and economic history. Horace H. Russell assisted Edwards in the preparation of this work.

There are twenty-five general bibliographies to Edwards' credit.

*Bibliographies of Special Phases of the History of Agriculture in the United States and in Other Countries.* Edwards' activities in this category resulted in the preparation and publication of 57 bibliographies. *References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History*, inspired by his interest in Frederick Jackson Turner, came out in 1935. This was reissued in 1939, enlarged from 63 to 99 pages. Everett was always intrigued with

agricultural museums and in 1936 prepared a 43-page list of *References on Agricultural Museums*. He was convinced that the agriculture of the early days in this country was too much neglected as a subject of study, and in 1938 published his *References on American Colonial Agriculture*. This work comprised 101 pages. Another excellent example of his activity was *A Bibliography on the Agriculture of the American Indians* which appeared in 1942 and contained 107 pages of references on this subject.

*Bibliographies of the Writings of and about Distinguished Americans Who Were Concerned with Agriculture.* In this group of references, Everett manifested his admiration for the agricultural contributions of several individuals well known for their services to this country. Among these should be mentioned *George Washington and Agriculture: A Classified List of Annotated References with an Introductory Note*, a bibliography of 25 pages which was published in 1931. Enlarged to 77 pages it was reissued in 1936. In 1934, Everett compiled a brief bibliography on John Pitkin Norton and in 1936, one on Johnny Appleseed. These were followed by others, also brief, relating to William Saunders, John Taylor of Caroline, and Thomas Jefferson, offered respectively in 1937, 1938, and 1944.

*Bibliographies of the Lives and Writings of American Historians Who Were Interested in Agricultural History.* Appreciation of the work of several historians who were active in studying our agricultural development was evidenced. In 1934 a 22-page "Bibliography of the Writings of Professor Ulrich Bonnell Phillips" appeared.

Four years later, Edwards' "Bibliography of the Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner and References on His Life and Work" appeared in *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*. Here, in addition to Edwards' bibliography, were reprinted four important essays by Turner including his famous paper on "The Significance of the Frontier," accompanied by a critical comparison of the several extant versions of this contribution and with an introduction on "Turner's Formative Period" by Fulmer Mood and a preface by Louise Phelps Kellogg. One of the first products of the University of Wisconsin Press, this book throughout processing and publication received the expert and careful attention of Livia Appel, Director of the Press, thus guaranteeing for the book both distinction of appearance and accuracy

of the editing. The result, in aggregate, was a notable historical publication, one of the best of 1938. In 1944, Edwards supplemented his contribution to the Turner volume with two pages of "Additional References on the Life and Work of Frederick Jackson Turner."

Long interested in the researches and writings of Joseph Schafer of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Edwards with Thomas J. Mayock compiled a 33-page "Bibliography of the Writings of Joseph Schafer," which was included in *Joseph Schafer: Student of Agriculture*, published by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in 1942. Another historian, commemorated by Edwards in bibliographical data, was Rodney H. True, the botanist and first president of the Agricultural History Society. The True bibliography, entitled "Rodney H. True and His Writings," came out in 1944.

*Bibliographies of Special Phases of the History of the United States and of Other Countries.* Among the important bibliographies showing diversity of interest were *References on the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Project*, first issued in 1932 and totaling 53 typewritten pages;<sup>18</sup> and *References on the Mountaineers of the Southern Appalachians*. The latter came out in 1935 and covered 148 pages. Lesser lists devoted to a variety of subjects were assembled between 1932 and 1935, such as "References on the Hudson Bay Route," and on American memorials and the significance of sectionalism. This was followed by one on the Filipinos in the United States, another on the anti-trust movement, and a third concerning Puerto Rico.

One of the most valuable of Edwards' projects was his Bibliographical Index. It was begun in the course of assembling information for his *Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States*, issued in 1930. At that time Everett found it convenient to classify, arrange, type on cards, and file his references according to general and special subjects. Subsequently the overall arrangement was expanded to embrace references to the history of other countries, particularly those relating to agricultural conditions and development. This in effect created an International Bibliographical Index for Agricultural History with special emphasis on the United States. As new items came into existence and old ones were discovered and made known, the Index was consist-

ently added to each year and so grew amazingly from a few thousand items in 1930 to upwards of a million items by 1952. The references in the Index, typed on 4 by 6 cards and filed, constitutes an unrivalled body of reference information, which is fluid in nature, with the contents susceptible of varied subject rearrangement. It was the existence of this constantly expanding material, serving as a reservoir of information, assembled by Edwards with the assistance of his office staff, which explains in part why he was able to compile and publish so many competent bibliographies in the years he was functioning in Washington.

Aside from an active teaching schedule, editing *Agricultural History*, and compiling numerous bibliographies, Edwards somehow managed to find the time for other scholarly endeavor, chiefly writing.<sup>19</sup>

Early in his career the idea of writing a definitive history of American agriculture had been an objective, which may have inspired the preparation of his bibliography on this subject. The immensity of such a project, including the difficulties involved in doing the necessary research, made him put it off and it was never accomplished. This is regrettable, for beginning with the 1930s, there was no American scholar who knew more about agricultural history or was better qualified to produce such a work. Edwards partly came to grips with the subject in a summary entitled "American Agriculture; The First 300 Years," which appeared in the 1940 *Yearbook* of the United States Department of Agriculture. This report devoted some 326 pages to an historical survey of American agriculture, of which Edwards contributed 105 pages. His section offers a promise of what he might have done with a more extended treatment.<sup>20</sup>

Hardly any phase of agricultural history escaped the probing of Everett's restless mind, and he has left us 111 articles. The first was a treatise on the sheep industry in the upper Ohio Valley, prepared for a Civil Service examination in 1926. Three years later he wrote of "American Farmers Who Were the Master Farmers of the Time." This furnished the basis for a speech by the Secretary of Agriculture. A paper on "The Historical

<sup>19</sup> For complete citations of Edwards' published writings see the bibliography in this issue compiled by Wayne D. Rasmussen and Helen H. Edwards.

<sup>20</sup> In addition to Everett E. Edwards' section in the 1940 *Yearbook*, stimulating discussion on other aspects of agricultural history are given by F. F. Elliott, Paul H. Johnstone, A. B. Genung and Chester C. Davis.

<sup>18</sup> This was reissued in 1936 and enlarged to 185 pages.



Background of the Present Situation in Southern Agriculture" for the Southeastern Economic Association appeared in 1930. Occasionally he ventured into other fields as when in 1931 he addressed the Shakespeare Society in Washington on the "Historical Background of Elizabethan Literature."

Between 1934 and 1944, the *Dictionary of American Biography* was enriched by sketches on Jonathan Periam, James L. Reid, William Jasper Spillman, A. C. True, Edward Lewis Sturtevant, and Gray Silver. Other studies which aroused scholarly and public interest were "Agricultural Societies," a study prepared for the course on the History of American Agriculture, offered in the Graduate School in the Department, in 1932, and "American Indian Contributions to Civilization," in *Minnesota History* in 1934.

Dairying was a subject into which he delved deeply. "T. L. Haecker, the Father of Dairying in Minnesota" and "Wendelin Grimm and Alfalfa" were representative of his work in this field. First printed in *Minnesota History* in 1938, both were translated into German for the *Tägliche Volkszeitung*. "The Swedes and American Agriculture" merited some twenty pages in 1938 and in 1942 and 1943 appeared "Rural Communities and the American Pattern" and "Frederick Jackson Turner's History of the Grignon Tract on the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers." In this last study Fulmer Mood was a joint editor. In 1946 Everett wrote 14 articles for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and the following year one for the *World Book Encyclopedia*.

The 1948 *Yearbook* of the Department of Agriculture contained a treatise by Edwards on "The Settlement of Grasslands," and in 1949 he returned to the subject of dairying in one of the last studies he made. This paper, designated as "Europe's Contribution to the American Dairy Industry" was published in the *Supplement* to the *Journal of Economic History* of that year. In the period from 1932 to 1942 *Agricultural History* and other learned journals published 11 articles by Edwards on various aspects of agricultural history as a field for research. Everett published an appreciation of Claribel R. Barnett, former librarian of the Department, in *Agricultural History* in 1951. The next year he wrote the foreword for Henry C. and Anne Dewees Taylor, *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932*.

Edwards did not confine his editorial capabilities solely to *Agricultural History*. In 1934, in the midst of the Great Depression, the Department of Agriculture, appropriately enough, sponsored a

reprint of James Cleghorn on the *Depressed State of Agriculture: An Essay Published by Order of the Highland Society of Scotland* in 1822. The new edition was inspired by Everett E. Edwards and contained a foreword by him. The latter's next venture in documentation, *Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Agriculture*, which reproduced selections from the writings of these men, and added editorial comment on their respective contributions, came out in the form of a 102-page pamphlet in 1937, to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Agriculture. Everett's last important documentary publication was *Jefferson and Agriculture: A Sourcebook in Commemoration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson*. This 84-page booklet was the principal publication offered by the Department of Agriculture to the public on this occasion in 1943. All of these brochures received wide distribution.

Radio broadcasts on Lincoln's birthday in 1931 and 1932 dealt with "Lincoln's Attitude Toward Farm Problems." "Minnesota's Agricultural Progress" was presented by Edwards over the University of Minnesota radio station, March 16, 1933.

At various times Edwards was asked to supply information for high officials of the Department and also executives in other branches of the Government. The data he prepared were usually designed to form the basis for addresses delivered by these men. The subject matter of some of these "command performances" is revealing. "The Republican Party: Its Origins and Its Principles" furnished Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary of the Department, with pertinent facts for a speech celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Founding of the Republican Party which was commemorated at Jackson, Michigan, July 6, 1929. Similarly, Edwards wrote about the Tennessee River Basin for the National Resources Board in 1933. He sent to Henry A. Wallace, then Secretary of the Department, for a Jackson Day Dinner Address, in December 1937, comments on the "Significance of Jacksonian Democracy." In 1939 Mr. Wallace also wanted to know something about the centennial of the *Southern Planter*, and received a memorandum on the subject.

In 1944 Edwards participated with C. A. Browne and Hugh H. Bennett in a Symposium at the Cosmos Club in Washington. The subject was "Jefferson's Fourth Freedom, Freedom From Hunger."

Edwards early became a contributor to *Social Science Abstracts* and between 1928 and 1932 wrote 62 condensations of articles and books for this attempt at making the publications of the social sciences more readily available.

Book reviewing was a more or less continuous activity from 1928 to 1952 and in this period Edwards read and commented upon 139 different works in 176 reviews. These included some of the more important publications of these years. Most of his judgments will stand the test of time. They offer clear indication of his capacity for analysis and interpretation.

One of the highlights of Edwards' career was his service as Secretary of the Bicentenary Committee for the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary celebration planned to honor the services of Thomas Jefferson to agriculture. It was sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture, and authorized by act of Congress December 3, 1943. Claude A. Wickard, Secretary of the Department, became the Chairman of the Bicentenary Committee and appointed Edwards as secretary.

A pilgrimage to Charlottesville and Monticello on April 13, 1944, was the high spot of a variety of enterprises arranged by the Committee. Assembling early in the morning in Washington, D. C., the members of the pilgrimage travelled by special car to Charlottesville, toured and viewed the architectural portions of the University of Virginia for which Jefferson was responsible, including the Lawn, famous serpentine walls, and student quarters, and reassembled at the Rotunda to listen to speeches, some of which were broadcast over the National Farm and Home Hour of NBC. After a picnic lunch at Monticello, there was more speaking and visits to several of Jefferson's farms in the vicinity, and also to his grave. At Shadwell, where he was born, and at other farms there was a demonstration of former and present methods of soil conservation, furnishing an illuminating comparison.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Addresses given in the Rotunda at noon were by Herbert A. Kellar, on "Living Agricultural Museums;" John R. Hutcheson, "A Tribute from the Land-Grant College Association;" Claude R. Wickard, on "Thomas Jefferson, The Founder of Modern Agriculture." At Monticello in the afternoon Edwin M. Betts of the University of Virginia spoke on "Jefferson's Gardens at Monticello" and James E. Ward of Clemson College on "Monticello: An Experimental Farm." Carl R. Woodward, President of Rhode Island State College, laid a

The Department of Agriculture was deeply interested in the Jefferson Bicentenary and carried out many of the suggestions offered by the Committee. Members of the Department held three meetings in April 1944, at the Cosmos Club which discussed different aspects of Jefferson's agricultural interest. In addition to Edwards' *Jefferson and Agriculture* it published and distributed *Thomas Jefferson, Soil Conservationist* by Hugh H. Bennett. Bennett had explained the soil conservation program at the Jefferson farms, and in part this dissertation was an expansion of his remarks at that time. Edwards gathered together a collection of excerpts from Jefferson's writings about agriculture and also contributions by others about him, as well as bibliographical files, which were made available for articles or programs about Jefferson. A series of photographs portraying Jefferson's life and contributions and a lecture text for a slide film, issued by the Agricultural Extension Service, were prepared by Helen L. Eddy of Edwards' office. These were for boys and girls activities, local farm organizations, and rural schools. Members of the Department wrote and published 18 articles on Jefferson in learned periodicals, and the Office of Exhibits of the Department showed a Jefferson Bicentenary Display in the Administration building April 9-23, 1944, which was visited by several thousand people. One of the features was an exhibit on the evolution of the plow, stemming from Jefferson's contributions to the art of plow making. Finally, as late as 1945, the Department dedicated the auditorium of the South Building and named it "The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Auditorium." It was also planned to deliver in this auditorium a series of lectures concerning Jefferson by well known scientists.

The Land-Grant Colleges, the Experiment Stations, and the Extension Services sent representatives to the pilgrimage at Charlottesville and Monticello, distributed literature on Jefferson's accomplishments, sent out Edwards' sourcebook on Jefferson, and made suggestions for Jefferson celebrations. Special activities were carried on in 18 states. National farm organizations were asked to publish articles about Jefferson in their publications. The agricultural press was represented at the pilgrimage, and published descriptions of it in their periodicals. They also distributed copies of

wreath on Jefferson's grave in behalf of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation. His remarks were entitled "Thomas Jefferson Survives."

*Jefferson and Agriculture* and copies of the speeches made at Charlottesville and Monticello. The scientific and learned societies held meetings and presented papers on Jefferson which they later published. The National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture recognized Jefferson in their activities. The United States Office of Education and related agencies suggested participation in Jefferson programs and writing and publication about Jefferson.

In its final meeting in June 1944, the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee adopted several recommendations, among which were the establishment of a Jefferson Birthplace Memorial Park, creation of a National Agricultural Museum, and commendation for the comprehensive edition of Jefferson's writings being compiled at Princeton University under the direction of Julian P. Boyd.

The national celebration of Thomas Jefferson's contributions to agriculture inaugurated and carried out by the Bicentenary Committee was an outstanding enterprise. Undertaken under difficult circumstances, during war time, it was soon generally recognized by those connected with the project that much of the credit for the success achieved was due to the wise choice of Everett Edwards as Secretary of the Committee. Early envisioning his responsibilities as involving more than administrative duties, which incidentally he managed skillfully, Edwards voluntarily provided much of the planning as well. His ideas proved to be so good that they were quickly accepted by the Committee and subsequently put into effect. Despite discouraging circumstances which arose upon occasion, Edwards continued throughout to have a sound faith in the worthwhile character of the enterprise. Everett had a deep regard for Jefferson and was greatly pleased that his own admiration and that of his countrymen could find expression in this way.<sup>22</sup>

Although Everett Edwards customarily talked freely with intimate friends and associates whom he knew well, as the years passed it became more and more evident that writing was his natural means of communication to the world. Expressing his thoughts and ideas on paper came easily, proving of aid in every sphere of his scholarly

activity. It undoubtedly increased the volume of his production, and also enabled him, through extensive correspondence, to keep in touch with friends and colleagues and to learn what was going on in the field of agricultural history, throughout the world. Further, writing of various types afforded him an opportunity to express his own views about many things.

Everett not only took an active part in the Agricultural History Society of which he was President, 1939-1940, but also to a lesser degree in other learned organizations. He served on the Advisory Committee to the President of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1946-1947, and as a member of the Editorial Board of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*; and was Vice President of the Economic History Association in 1945-1946 and a member of the Editorial Board for their journal. When possible he attended the meetings of these various groups, where he was a well known figure, sometimes presenting papers or presiding at sessions. If not so engaged, he could usually be found in conference with one of his colleagues or several graduate students. Everett liked to entertain at meetings and occasionally gave parties jointly with the writer or others.

Edwards' official work in the Division of Statistical and Historical Research of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was strenuous, varied, and interesting. Much of it consisted of the preparation of bibliographical and other writings and the pursuit of major lines of research, such as dairying, for the Department. Then there were inquiries, chiefly about agricultural history matters, which came in by mail or telephone, or were made in personal visits. These inquiries originated with officials of the Department of Agriculture or of other divisions of the Government, and also with scholars, students, and other individuals throughout the United States. Sometimes questions came from foreign countries. Edwards gradually rose in rank in his Division until he became Senior Agricultural Historian. On May 14, 1952, he was presented posthumously a Superior Service Award by the Department, but was not notified of this impending honor in time and died without knowing about it.

On first coming to Washington, Everett devoted most of his leisure hours to research and writing and led a limited social life. Gradually his circle widened and he enlarged his social contacts. On several occasions in the 1930s while visiting in

<sup>22</sup> Everett E. Edwards, "The National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee: Its Activities and Recommendations." Reprinted from *Agricultural History* 19: 167-190 (July 1945).



Washington, Everett asked me to go with him to informal parties given by friends. These gatherings were quite gay and Edwards took an active part in the festivities.

Everett remained a bachelor for the first 11 years of his stay in Washington. On May 20, 1938, he married an attractive and intelligent girl, Helen Evelyn Heckler of Evanston, Illinois, who at the time had a responsible position in the Social Security Agency in Washington.

This marriage was a significant event in Everett's life. It brought him much personal happiness and his friends and associates noticed that thereafter outwardly at least, he mellowed in his attitude toward his work and life in general. He now began to entertain more and the Edwards' home at 8606 Jefferson Street, Bethesda, Maryland, became a social center for his friends, professional colleagues, and graduate students. Everett now had opportunity to again engage in cultivating plants and flowers and spent leisure hours in landscaping his yard. He soon succeeded in making the grounds most attractive in appearance. The advent of the Edwards children, Thomas F. and Terence E., added to his contentment with his home. You had only to see him there, amidst the background of his books, and accompanied by his charming wife, happy romping children and the family dog, to realize what his marriage meant to him.

Everett Edwards' appearance and personality presented contradictions. In his general makeup he gave a distinct impression that here was one who had spent long hours out of doors and was no stranger to the buffeting of wind, rain, heat, and cold, belying the fact that most of his adult life had been spent at occupations indoors. His large well knit frame was covered with muscle, giving a suggestion of considerable physical strength. He was a scholar, but did not resemble one in the usual conception of such an individual. Actually it was his powers of physical endurance in combination with an inquiring mind that kept him alert in his chosen field. Edwards dressed well, although carelessly at times, and looked distinguished in a tuxedo. His hair, naturally light brown, had grown sparse through the years and was beginning to gray particularly around the temples. Naturally emotional, he had learned to suppress his feelings outwardly, except to intimate friends, and when so minded could assume a "dead pan look" by way of protective coloration. The key to his mood was in his deep blue eyes. These could greet you with

genial joviality, regard you seriously, assume a look of wariness, or be cold with anger.

About five feet nine inches in height, and weighing approximately 180 pounds he was somewhat round shouldered, stooped slightly, and seemed to have a short, stocky figure, until he straightened up. Then an observer realized his height and the excellent proportion of his body. In walking he took short rapid steps on the balls of his feet without seeming to lift them to any extent. As he came toward you he gave the illusion of rolling a little with each step as a sailor just off a ship might do.<sup>23</sup>

Edwards was customarily quiet and dignified in manner, and serious in mien. Only when his emotions broke through his reserve did he become animated. He often made me think of an English country squire, a comparison enhanced by his general build, ruddy complexion, and occasionally explosive temperament.

There were several marked idiosyncrasies which Edwards' close friends sometimes deplored. Chief of these was frequent pessimism about his work, and everything going on in the nation. At such times, he would be caustic and cynical of men and events, bureaucracy, and the Washington scene. Conscious of his own talents, and of his hard work, he felt that his efforts were not always appreciated. He worried too much when others did not share his keen sense of personal responsibility. Honest intellectually, sincere and fair in his mind and actions, he hated injustice whether applied to himself, to others, or to a cause, and had difficulty in concealing his feelings, even when to show them was obviously impractical as far as effecting any change was concerned. He had prejudices but they were those of a passionate liberal. In his relations with people, he was not always diplomatic especially if their ideas did not agree with those which he held. In short, in some ways he tended to be an unhappy person too much of the time. This was in contrast to his bold vision about his work and many other matters.

He did not apply the same viewpoint to his own

<sup>23</sup> Wesley Edwards offers an interesting explanation of Everett's gait. Referring to his early life on the farm, he suggests that "following the drag harrow was very hard work; it was difficult to walk over the rough, plowed ground, and one was inclined to 'lean' a little bit on the horses and lift one's feet as little as possible while balancing on the rough clods." See Wesley Edwards' Comments to Helen Edwards, Mar. 17, 1953.

personal affairs. Here he was conservative to a surprising degree. This was apparent in his relations with officials of the Department, where his failure to be personally aggressive told against him. Perhaps Edwards' negative qualities did not aid him in getting along materially in the world. However, many of them were to his credit and showed his fineness of character.

On the positive side Everett had a delightful sense of humor. In common with his English ancestors he could not become too objective about matters which affected him closely. He took these seriously. About other things his appreciation of humor was keen. He loved good stories, collected them as a connoisseur, and delighted in relating them to his friends.

Everett knew personally and professionally many people in this country and also a smaller group abroad. He was favorably known, without personal acquaintance, to thousands of other individuals. His intimate friends were comparatively limited in number. Possibly the two to whom he felt closest were Rodney Loehr of the University of Minnesota and the writer. Rodney was in Germany in the spring of 1952 and when I wrote to him about Everett he made the following comment about their friendship: "I first met Everett in the summer of 1931 when I had gone to Washington to do graduate work. He was extremely helpful, as he has always been to people who need help. Since that time our friendship has been unbroken. The next year he came to Minnesota and then drove back East with us via Canada, Maine and to Washington. I can remember vividly the journey and how in Quebec, when we stayed at a pension, the old innkeeper thought that as Everett was the older, he belonged with my wife. We agreed on most things, which I suppose is the mark of friendship, and I found Everett always a tower of strength. One could always rely upon him. His judgments were excellent. He made the magazine and the society. I always considered him the best editor of historical publications in the country."

Others who come within the scope of my knowledge as being particularly good friends of Everett are Frederick Merk of Harvard University, Fulmer Mood of the University of Texas, Lewis Atherton, Elmer Ellis and Thomas Brady of the University of Missouri, Edward N. Wentworth of Armour's Livestock Bureau of Chicago, Arthur G. Peterson of the Munitions Board, Charles A. Burmeister formerly of the Department of Agriculture, Albert

V. House of Harpur College, New York, and the late Richard J. Purcell of the Catholic University of America, and his wife, Clara Fick Purcell, who was a classmate at Carleton College. This group could be enlarged.<sup>24</sup>

The writer's first contact with Everett was in 1927. We took to each other quickly, found we spoke the same language, and formed a friendship which continued without interruption. The only drawback to our relations was that we saw each other too infrequently. Mostly we met in Washington, Chicago, or Evanston or at sessions of historical societies held in various parts of the country. Wherever this was, and no matter how long the interval between, we instantly took up in our thought where we had left off on the previous occasion. It was our habit in meeting, say at a gathering of a historical organization, to adjourn to his or my room and spend several hours or half a day catching up with events since we had last been together. These long conversations were mutually stimulating intellectually and meant much to both of us. At other times we wrote letters, Everett more than I did.

I had the utmost respect for my friend's mind and character. We understood each other and had no reservations in talking or writing. His abilities won my admiration and he was one of the few whose intellectual integrity I trusted completely.

Everett had acquired much scholarly wisdom through the years and in consequence was often asked to serve on committees of organizations. At sessions of these he often puzzled people because he said very little, his natural reticence tending to keep him silent, particularly if he did not know the other members very well. However, I soon noticed that he was a keen observer and missed nothing of what was occurring; if you bided your time and were persistent in making him talk, you obtained surprising and worthwhile results. He had superior powers of analysis. Also he had frequently spent time prior to such a meeting thinking about the subject to be discussed and had original ideas about it.

In August 1950, Everett had a serious heart

<sup>24</sup> Helen Edwards in a statement, Nov. 18, 1952, mentions other good friends, Howard F. McMurdie, Mary J. McMurdie, and James C. King who were students, when Everett was at Northwestern University. Ernest Lauer of Northwestern who stimulated Everett's interest in social and intellectual history should also be included.

attack. He, however, returned to his office at the end of November 1950. In July 1951, Everett suffered a stroke, and did not again return to his office. During the following months his condition gradually improved and he had high hopes of completely regaining his health. Just before the meeting of the American Historical Association in New York City in December 1951, I stopped for a day at his home in Bethesda, and again spent some time with him immediately after the close of the meeting, when I reported on the outcome of the sessions of the Agricultural History Society, for which he had previously arranged. He was delighted to learn of their success and we had a pleasant visit talking about many things, mainly the Agricultural History Society and the journal. His health was not yet sufficiently improved to go back to work but he planned to do so in the spring. Helen and Everett drove me to the railroad station the next day and that was the last time I saw him. He could not come to the Mississippi Valley Historical Association meeting in Chicago in April 1952, because of a slight set back, due to a cold. On May 1, 1952 he had another heart attack and died suddenly. The ordeal of his illness was now over.

The repercussions resulting from the death of Everett Edwards, when they became known, were rather amazing. Few had realized how much he

had meant to so many people because of his helpfulness in giving of his knowledge and counsel to others. This feeling was made abundantly clear in numerous letters and telegrams sent to his family and to officers of the Agricultural History Society. Supplementing these communications were others containing voluntary contributions addressed to the Secretary and proposing that a fund be raised by the Society to create a memorial of some kind in Everett's honor. The real appreciation of his services expressed by all of these individuals would I think have surprised and pleased him if he could have known of their regard.

The thought of creating a memorial for Everett Edwards had already been discussed by officers of the Agricultural History Society and they were much heartened to learn that this idea was so widespread. A memorial will be established and a committee of the Agricultural History Society is now working out plans to determine what form it should take.

I now add Everett Edwards to the group of men,<sup>25</sup> few in number, it has been my good fortune to have known intimately through the years, and whom I call great, because of their abilities, fine qualities, and services to scholarship.

<sup>25</sup> Others in the group are Dana Carleton Munro, Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, Robert C. Binkley, and Douglas C. McMurtrie.

## EVERETT E. EDWARDS—PUBLIC SERVANT

O. V. WELLS

*Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture*

The editor of this Journal has asked for a statement regarding Everett E. Edwards' contributions as a member of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. And I want to begin with a disclaimer: What I have to say is entirely a personal judgment rather than an endeavor to arrive at any consensus of what others may think.

I also want to say a word about the background with which I approach this task. Although I worked in the same Bureau with Edwards over most of the years from 1929 into 1952, our social contacts were limited to three brief occasions, two of which simply amounted to sitting on the

same plot of grass in the shade of the same trees and having outdoor lunch together some 20-odd years ago. Those two casual meetings so many years ago did give me some insight into Edwards' interest in economic history. However, most of my information about Edwards comes from an awareness of his work rather than acquaintance with the man himself.

It seemed to me in the early 1930s and still seems to me that Edwards was one of the outstanding scholars in the Bureau. There is a tradition which exists both within and without the Bureau that Edwards spent most of his life in the

service of others. But this tradition needs examining; it seems to me to be true only in a narrow, commendably specialized sense.

Actually, as the years go by I think we will find that Edwards' leading works will prove more enduring than some of the more publicized activities or volumes of both his colleagues and his immediate predecessors. Edwards' service and basic devotion was to agricultural history; innumerable services to others were by no means a haphazard taking care of run-of-mill requests but rather were chiefly the servicing of those people and institutions which in Edwards' opinion were making or were capable of making a real contribution to agricultural history.

I am not an agricultural historian, nor do I presume to professional judgment on the 354 items which I understand are listed in the Edwards' bibliography. But nevertheless there still stand out in my mind five works or projects which I think mark Edwards' stature, although one of these is a sample, the choice of which I admit must be charged to the accident of personal interest.

First, there is the magnificent bibliography, *History of Agriculture in the United States*, released as U. S. Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication 84 in 1930. This was, I am sure, the culmination of Edwards' training and early work in agricultural history, as well as of several years of concentrated work after his coming with the Bureau in 1927.

The second item which I recall is the contribution to the volume from the University of Wisconsin Press, *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*. This volume, of course, is chiefly devoted to Turner's essays, but it does contain two sections prepared by Edwards—a Bibliography of the Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner and a selected list of references on the life and work of Frederick Jackson Turner. This section is in a way representative of the kind of services which Edwards quite often rendered.

The third item which I believe deserves high regard is the contribution "American Agriculture—The First 300 Years," which occupies something over a hundred pages in the *Yearbook of Agriculture* for 1940. It is true that this was written on assignment within a relatively limited time. But Edwards had been teaching his history course and working on the raw materials for this assignment for a dozen years or so, and he turned in an excellent manuscript.

The next two contributions which I would list as major have to be looked at as projects, not as publications. They are the stream of students who took his course on the History of American Agriculture from 1927 onward, and the official journal of this Society, *Agricultural History*, over the 25 years ending in 1952.

Too few people are acquainted with Edwards' activities as a teacher. Certainly he was handicapped here since he did not happen to be in one of our great colleges or universities where an outstanding teacher tends to gain some fame as well as spread his ideas through graduate students. But the fact remains that Edwards did offer a course in the History of American Agriculture in the after hours program of the Graduate School of the U. S. Department of Agriculture starting in 1927.

This course continued in the Graduate School until Edwards' sickness forced its discontinuance in 1951, with various excursions to other institutions, including American University and one or two of the land-grant colleges. Over the years I think there is no doubt but that Edwards did influence a considerable number of research workers toward studying historical backgrounds in terms of understanding the forces which bring about changes, giving economists and statisticians an institutional view which all too many of them are inclined to neglect.

But the single greatest project and contribution of Edwards as an agricultural historian was, I suspect, this journal, *Agricultural History*. He was assisting in the editing of the journal before it had reached its first birthday, was officially listed as assistant editor in October 1928, editor from October 1931. I also understand from my historian friends that this journal, the only one in its field, has gradually become known as one of the best-edited of all historical journals. Further, when Edwards became editor, the Society had a relatively small membership and I personally know that he had on occasion to deal with its financial difficulties as well as edit its journal.

What I have been trying to say is that Edwards' work, though not spectacular, was basic. More than anyone else I have known in the Bureau, he came closer to being a true scholar, to finding ways of keeping his energies devoted to his main purpose.

There are, I suppose, two different ways in which one might remember Edwards' connection with the Bureau. There is an official citation which accompanied the Department's Superior Service



Award to Edwards—an award which came too late for Edwards himself to receive it. The citation reads: "For delineating the history of American agriculture as a field of research and for stimulating an understanding of the evolution of agricultural problems." But I am not much given to remembering citations, and I shall chiefly remember Edwards as almost perfectly fitting a remark made in the early 1930s by Dr. O. C. Stine, Edwards' first sponsor in the Bureau.

An extremely able analytical statistician was in the process of leaving the Bureau and the question was raised as to who might replace the man. I remember Dr. Stine's reply very well, "Young man, you don't replace such men. You just hope you can hire somebody else for the same money who will in turn develop his own special abilities." Edwards developed his own special abilities, and one thing on which I am sure we all agree is that he will not be replaced.

### EVERETT E. EDWARDS—SCHOLAR AND TEACHER

LEWIS E. ATHERTON

*Department of History, University of Missouri*

In my estimation, Everett E. Edwards has been the outstanding *scholar* among American agricultural historians of the past two decades. Accurate, painstaking, objective scholarship governed his life. His early death was due in part to the intensity of his scholarly interests. Few men can work the long hours which he habitually followed. He gave freely of his time and knowledge to others, thus adding to his already heavy load of work. In picking members of the editorial board of *Agricultural History*, in choosing papers for programs sponsored by the Agricultural History Society, and in selecting articles for publication Edwards invariably placed scholarship above administrative and promotional ends in making decisions. He did not ask that scholars belong to the Agricultural History Society before sharing in its benefits. Instead, it was evident to him that the Society was set up to serve scholars and scholarship without regard to loyalty, membership, or personalities. He was not averse to recognition. He worked hard not because he was in a hurry to win attention but because he liked his work. His discontent came from failure to reach the extremely high levels of craftsmanship which he set for himself.

Everett E. Edwards made an outstanding contribution in his long service as editor of *Agricultural History*. He welcomed articles covering all ages of history and all sections of the world. Distinguished scholars and unknown students alike contributed to the journal during his editorship. Theoretical expositions of the agricultural-ladder theory, of the cultural interplay of ideas, of the

possible similarities of agricultural frontiers, searching analyses of safety-valve theories, and straight, factual reporting illustrate the range of articles which Edwards accepted for publication. He asked only that contributors avoid bombast and pedantry. And every article was carefully checked for accuracy and form.

Everett E. Edwards made an outstanding contribution to agricultural history as a bibliographer. His *Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States*, which appeared first in 1930, has already served a generation of agricultural historians. Other titles, like *References on Economic History as a Field of Research and Study*, issued in 1936, and *References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History*, dated 1939, illustrate the range of his bibliographical interest but touch only a very small segment of his total work in that field.

Everett E. Edwards also made an outstanding contribution to agricultural history as a teacher. I saw him teach at the University of Missouri during the 1939 summer session. He was not a great undergraduate teacher. He was more than adequate for all students because he had something to offer, but his influence was greatest on outstanding undergraduates and graduate students. At the start of his courses here at Missouri he gave each student a stack of mimeographed excerpts from key materials and bibliographical aids which facilitated his work from the first day. Because Edwards took a professional attitude toward his students and wasted little effort on



enticing laggards, he had time and energy and knowledge to give to those really interested. As a colleague of his during that summer session, I obtained a set of his mimeographed materials which I still find highly useful in my own research and teaching. Some members of his classes that summer got started on significant historical research. Edwards was also a great teacher over the years in the personal help which he extended to students from many universities in the United States and abroad. Within the past two weeks the University of Missouri *Studies* has released a monograph on Norman J. Colman and Colman's *Rural World* in which the author acknowledges his debt to Edwards for pertinent suggestions on bibliography and style. Shortly after Mr. Edwards' death, I received a letter addressed to the president of Agricultural History Society. It came from the Far East and the writer had struggled to express his thoughts and feelings in a little-used tongue. He was determined, however, that someone who knew Edwards should be aware that students in distant places had been distressed at news of his death. The writer credited Edwards with having supplied him with significant bibliographical data on which his own research work

had been based. This and other letters testified to Edwards' influence on younger scholars whom he never saw face to face.

Everett E. Edwards also contributed to agricultural history by articles and monographic material. His 100-page history of the first 300 years of American agriculture which appeared in the United States Department of Agriculture *Year-book* for 1940 is the best single history of American agriculture available.

Everett E. Edwards also served as a clearing house for pertinent information concerning the teaching and writing of agricultural history. Even after his first serious illness he collected data on the number and types of courses in agricultural history available in American colleges. Although he accomplished much in his fifty-three years, his impatience with his own progress and with the progress of the society to which he dedicated his efforts, led him to chart new and expanded programs for study. Those interested in agricultural history should read his short but significant article "Objectives for the Agricultural History Society during Its Second Twenty-five Years" which appeared in *Agricultural History* in October, 1944.

## RURAL COMMUNITIES AND THE AMERICAN PATTERN

EVERETT E. EDWARDS

*Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture*

In the present world crisis, much is being said and written about the counter-opposing and irreconcilable ideologies that are struggling for domination and survival.<sup>1</sup> The people of the United States adhere to democracy, and, indeed, they can hardly do otherwise unless they consciously and deliberately flaunt their past. In the course of the struggle, it may well be that the congeries of

ideals and values that the American people think of as democracy will, of necessity, be transvaluated. The resettlements may be more dynamic, and they may seem new. Yet, it is safe to assume that discerning students will be able to trace them back to the grassroots of the nation's history. In other words, the United States is irrevocably committed to continuing as a democracy, and, this being true, it behooves us to provide the media by which democracy—political, social, and economic—will continue to meet its destiny, forearmed and unafraid.

To meet this challenge, it is essential that we comprehend the anatomy and the heredity of the bases of the ideals, values, and actions which are referred to, often far too casually, as the American way of life. To do so, we must study the origin

<sup>1</sup> This article is a version of the paper prepared for presentation at the joint session of the American Association for State and Local History with the American Historical Association that was to have been held at Columbus, Ohio, on December 29, 1942. It was printed in the American Historical Association, *Annual Report, 1942*, 3: 253-259 (Washington, 1944) and it is here reprinted with permission of the American Historical Association.

and development of these elements. By virtue of the nature of our country's history, this takes us to the thousands of rural communities which, despite the almost overwhelming impact of urbanization, must be recognized as the generating centers of what we seek.

The data derivable from historical studies of rural communities have important uses. Aside from the opportunities to exploit all the sources pertaining to the history of the areas covered, a diversified and representative series of such studies would afford a substantial basis for the generalizations that are essential to the larger canvasses.<sup>2</sup> They would, in essence, provide the realities of what Frederick Jackson Turner termed "the vital forces" that called institutions into life and shaped them to meet changing conditions.

Studies of rural communities also have a contribution to make to the unfolding and fulfillment of democracy. Only recently has the leadership in the social system begun to consider the evolvement of techniques that facilitate the exploration and fruition of the native potentialities of all mentally and physically normal human beings. To date, the social systems have been content to liberate only the powers of the privileged, and the total result has been a colossal waste of human energies and capacities. It is this social tyranny that has been the primal active cause of the social maladjustments and unrests incident to the instabilities of the past. Lasting peace and justice can come into being only when every individual in every social group is enabled to contribute his maximum—socially, culturally, and economically—to the groups to which he belongs and when these groups in turn contribute their maximum to the individual.

Intelligent planning—both national and local—is essential to the achievement of this *summum bonum*. The national leadership must have the data that indicate why communities function in unison in certain respects and diverge in others. As already indicated, community histories should contribute measurably to this end.

The processes of individual and group fulfill-

<sup>2</sup> The reports on the six communities studied contemporaneously in 1940 by members of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are interesting and stimulating examples. The communities studied were El Cerrito, N. M.; Sublette, Kan.; Irwin, Ia.; the Old Order Amish in Lancaster County, Pa.; Landaff, N. H.; and Harmony, Ga.

ment must be democratic.<sup>3</sup> The individual must be enabled to see significances in the features of the physical environment where he functions. This environment must be interesting to him. Likewise he needs a realization of the values of the cultural heritage of his community. To understand its past is to free him for the present and future. An understanding of the basic phenomena of his community should strengthen and increase his capacities for observation and generally enrich his life and that of the community as a whole. The trained historians can, and should, contribute community histories that serve this end, but the preparation of such studies should not be confined to academic towers. The process of acquiring knowledge of the historical backgrounds of communities must be democratized.<sup>4</sup> The work of the American Association for State and Local History definitely points in this direction.

In studying the history of any community, consideration must be given to primal factors—the people and the geographic mold which constitutes its physical setting.<sup>5</sup> The physiography, climate, and soils of a community provide both limitations and advantages for the population that undertakes to live there. An intelligent comprehension of many phases of community history and especially the history of crop production, including the shifts and adjustments, is possible only if the geographic factors are considered. In this respect, the historians are largely dependent on the monographic literature of the geographers and the soil, climatic, and types-of-farming bulletins of the departments of agriculture and experiment stations.

The colonization and settlement of a community is a basic part of its history. For most communities,

<sup>3</sup> The democratization of planning is considered in Ellery A. Foster and Harold A. Vogel, "Cooperative Land Use Planning—A New Development in Democracy," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1940, 1138-56. See also Rensis Likert, "Democracy in Agriculture—Why and How?" *ibid.*, 994-1002.

<sup>4</sup> For a concrete illustration of the use of historical data by laymen, see N. S. Hadley, "76 Farmers Make a Map," U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, *Land Policy Review*, 3: 15-21 (Jan.-Feb. 1940).

<sup>5</sup> This discussion of the topics to be included in historical studies of rural communities is a condensation and redaction of the author's suggestions in an article on "Agricultural History as a Field of Research," in Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1941, 15-22.

the story has been told in general terms not only many times but in many ways, and further work should be concentrated, so far as the sources permit, on realities. The social and economic status of the settlers and of the succeeding generations of newcomers was a factor in the development of their farmsteads and communities. So also were the settlers' preconceived ideas on farming. Although they may have attempted to follow the agricultural practices familiar to them in the localities from which they came, they were compelled to respond to the actualities of their new environment. The hesitation of the pioneers on the edge of certain geographical regions and the ultimate conquest of them are striking examples of this adjustment process. The reasons why the different groups of settlers selected or perhaps simply found themselves on certain types of land also deserve attention. The elements that entered into the site selections of certain national and subnational groups also need to be investigated.

Communities that are different from those adjacent to them because they were settled by distinctive immigrant, religious, and social elements are deserving of special attention. Careful study of these cultural islands should contribute to a better understanding of the specific contributions of the various immigrant groups. Although there are many valuable monographs on the chief immigrant groups, specific treatments of the actual adjustments by which they became farmers in a new and foreign land and of their ultimate and distinctive contributions are still lacking. Physical environment has been found inadequate in explaining certain developments, and historians and sociologists have been turning to the cultural backgrounds of the human elements. Professor Richard H. Shryock's studies of the contrasts of the agriculture of the British and Pennsylvania Germans in the American colonies have given new emphasis to the importance of cultural heritage,<sup>6</sup> and studies of distinctive communities would not only help explain much of the interest to the student of immigration but contribute data on

social and economic mores that can be utilized in advancing a better America.

Although the general outline of the policies by which the land of the public domain passed from the Federal and state governments to individual owners is known, there is still need of delineating their operation in specific communities. The policies as outlined in statutes are by no means the entire story. Probably more significant are the processes by which land ultimately came into the possession of the farmers who actually turned the soil and made farms. The activities of land companies and the extent and importance of land speculation as well as its relation to tenancy need to be considered. Generally speaking, the public domain was distributed to private individuals with no restrictions on mode of use, and the result in many communities has been widespread human suffering as well as devastation of the land by erosion. The reconciliation of private exploitation of land with the public interest has become the crux of the problem of developing realistic land policies, and the details of the actual disposition of land in a community must be given consideration.

Useful analyses of tenancy have been made by agricultural economists and rural sociologists, but thus far few, if any, adequate historical studies of this phase of rural America have been made. The nature of the available sources and the complexity of the subject may, in part, explain this relative neglect. Discerning studies of the beginnings and nature of tenancy and the economic and social factors accentuating its increase are needed, and it would seem that attention to tenancy in community histories will contribute measurably not only to an understanding of the local setting but of the national as well.

Crops and livestock are also an essential part of community histories. Historically considered, agricultural maps have assumed their present forms because of the operation of the many forces which, grouped together, are usually referred to as the agricultural revolution. So far as the specific community is concerned, it is essential to know the changing ways of farm management, the crops and varieties that have been tried, the shifting interests in livestock and its improvement, and the efforts toward diversification.

In addition to land and management, the other instrumentalities of agricultural production and rural life—namely, labor and equipment—need to be included. The ways in which the inadequacies

<sup>6</sup> The allusion is to Richard H. Shryock, "British versus German Traditions in Colonial Agriculture," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 26: 36-54 (June 1939); "Cultural Factors in the History of the South," *Journal of Southern History*, 5: 333-346 (August 1939); and "The Pennsylvania Germans in American History," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 63: 261-281, (July 1939).

of the labor supply have been met—the indentured servant, the slave, the hired man, transient labor, etc.—have barely been mentioned in national histories, and specific data from community histories will be very helpful. The same statement may be made for farm buildings, horse and other draft power, implements and machinery, fences, seeds, feeds, and other equipment.

The effects of the steps in the mechanization of agriculture are dramatic and therefore obvious in a general way, but the full significance and implication are not generally realized or known. Mechanization has greatly altered the traditional units of farming, and the nature of governmental policies relating thereto are affected. The seemingly mundane history of the farm implements and machinery is, therefore, a vital phase of community histories.

The ways of financing the economic operations of communities are likewise important. Incomes and expenditures, banking methods, interest rates, mortgages and foreclosures, taxation, insurance in all forms, and monetary legislation affecting community life must be included in the studies here projected. Quite possibly the historians will need the assistance of the economists in delineating this phase.

The marketing of products from rural communities—the steps by which they were moved from the farmyards to the consumers' kitchens—has many ramifications. The fact that leading historians have emphasized that the development of marketing is the central force in economic phenomena adds emphasis to the importance of this topic. Problems incident to marketing have often been the main bases of protest movements, and the economic factors involved in the spread between what the producer receives and the consumer pays deserve careful delineation. The various ways in which the farmers have sought to increase their share of the retail charge and the multitudinous functions that governments have been forced to assume as a means of aiding them or the consumer public generally are significant parts of this topic. Likewise, co-operative marketing deserves attention. Both producer and consumer co-operatives can make notable contributions to social and political as well as economic democracy and comparative and chronological studies within community frameworks.

The population of rural communities as consumers outlines still other topics. The food raised

on farms and its preparation, the role of the country store, and the rise of the mail-order house are among the subjects to be considered. Probably most important of all is the shift from relative economic self-sufficiency to a dominant commercial economy. Practically all farm homes once produced most of what they needed in the form of consumer goods—food, clothing, furniture, soap, candles, and many other articles. The migration of industries from farms to factories brought vast changes in the technical processes of manufacturing, greatly increased market demands for farm commodities incident to the growth of urban centers, and a tendency toward specialization in agriculture. This historical phenomenon is, in short, the central fact of both the agricultural and the industrial revolutions and has an important place in community histories.

The transportation of rural communities has passed through a number of significant stages of development. The important trails, rivers, canals, and railroads have received considerable attention in national transportation history, but each community has had its relation to these modes of transport. Much less is known of the influence of improved roads and especially the effects of the motor truck and automobile. The truck is recognized as the primary mode of marketing in most surplus-producing regions, but the effects of the automobile and the radio as modern means of transportation and communication on the organization of rural life are less tangible. At least the advent of the automobile put the population of many communities on fast and far-moving wheels and undermined the elements that once constituted the cohesiveness of communities as social and economic entities. The radio, in contrast, has assaulted intellectual rather than physical provincialism, and may yet, therefore, prove an integrating factor. The effects of the extension of the mobile and communication range of the population of communities on their local social, economic, and political institutions assumes crucial importance, therefore, for those who desire virility in community life.

In this connection, the instrumentalities devised by farmers and their governments to secure various economic and social ends deserve special attention. Agricultural organizations of all kinds and descriptions—fairs; periodicals; the Federal and state departments of agriculture; the agricultural schools, colleges, and experimental stations; the



farmers' institutes; the extension and demonstration work; the county agent system; and the 4-H and similar clubs—have all served as media by which the findings of science and information on changing world conditions have reached the farmers. Here are institutions that are the bases of democratic action in the fulfillment of community objectives.

The individuals who have contributed notably to the development of their communities also deserve attention. Some few communities will have contributed inventors, scientists, leaders, writers, and even statesmen to the national scene, but all have persons who have pioneered and supplied leadership in phases of community activity.

The rural home and the distinctly social aspects of community life need attention. The farmhouse with its furnishings, conveniences, and surroundings; rural manners, customs, and morals; amusements and entertainments such as games and sports, sociables, surprise parties, and spelling, husking, and quilting bees; and religious ideas and practices—these and many similar topics must be traced in terms of community evolution if we are to know our social history and if it, in turn, is to serve the needs of community life. In addition, we must not forget rural health, including diet, sanitation, home remedies, and the country doctor, and

the local media of transmitting news such as the newspaper and the telephone.

Possibly most important is the history of the local grade and high schools. Granted that it is the function of education to develop the individual so that he may serve the common good as a rational and social being, it is important to know the extent to which the schools he attended fulfilled their function and the media they used to effect the ends achieved.

The relation of the population of rural communities to political, economic, and social movements beyond their borders should also be considered. Especially important are the less tangible contributions that rural communities have made to the national life. The drift of the younger generations to the cities is an example. The rural mores derived in this process tempered urbanization and prolonged the social heritages of rural America. There is also the financial drain from the rural communities to the cities that comes with the settlement of estates.

The prospectus here sketched for the study of rural communities may seem all-embracing, but this approach is essential if we are to delineate the American pattern of life. It is imperative if we are to make history a living instrumentality for the social good.

## EVERETT E. EDWARDS AS I KNEW HIM

CHARLES A. BURMEISTER

*Washington, D. C.*

Everett Edwards was shy and retiring in his relations with others. Because of this he was not readily approachable and did not acquire close friends easily. Many of his fellow workers probably never got to know him intimately. Most of them never fully appreciated his unusual ability as a scholar, his deep insight in the historical background of the economic development of our country, his high standards of editorial craftsmanship, his sympathetic willingness to help others, and his fortitude in facing the ravages of ill health.

It was my privilege to have known him for more than 20 years and to have worked with him as he labored and strived to make *Agricultural History* an outstanding journal in literary excellence. Our

acquaintance and friendship began with my attendance at his first course of lectures in agricultural history in the Graduate School of the U. S. Department of Agriculture in the late 1920s. In that course he brought out most vividly and most interestingly all the many forces and elements which contributed to the development of our agricultural economy and the rural life of our nation from its beginning. He not only revealed and stressed the interrelations of all these forces and their cause and effect, but he did it in such a way as to make those of us in attendance feel that we had actually witnessed what had been so vividly set forth.

Notwithstanding that the course extended over

only a few months, it served as a most excellent foundation for the acquisition of a broad knowledge and understanding of agricultural economics and the present day problems of agriculture. I shall always have a deep feeling of appreciation for what I learned from him in that short time.

In our relations in later years in looking after the affairs and interests of the Agricultural History Society, he was most cooperative and helpful in every way and always more than willing to take over more than his share of any task that needed to be done. This was especially true even when ill health had taken his vitality and strength and he

was fully aware that his remaining days were few in number. Edwards' character can best be epitomized in the words of one of his superiors who said to me, "If Edwards had given more time to his own work rather than to helping others he would have advanced much further." My reply to this would be, "Yes, possibly true, but if he had done otherwise it would not have been in keeping with his character as I knew him."

In the comparatively short span of years allotted to him he contributed much to the field of knowledge in which he specialized and he held to ideals and standards to which we all might well aspire.

## A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF EVERETT EUGENE EDWARDS

WAYNE D. RASMUSSEN AND HELEN H. EDWARDS, *Editors*

*Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture*

The preparation of this bibliography was aided immeasurably by the existence of a list of the writings of Everett E. Edwards, compiled by Edwards in 1939 with yearly additions up to 1950. The list was not complete but was virtually so. It included many typewritten and processed items that received only very limited circulation. These items, which are not included in this bibliography, are, for the most part, available for use in the files of the History Section of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

During his service of 25 years in the Department of Agriculture, Everett E. Edwards made notable contributions to agricultural history through his work as an author, editor, bibliographer, instructor, and critic. Something of each of these aspects in his career is illustrated by items in the bibliography. The complete list, including typewritten and processed works and revised editions of works previously published, totals 476 items, not including the many news notes and comments appearing in *Agricultural History*. The items may be classified as follows: 41 original published articles; 7 edited articles, reports, and monographs in addition to editorial work for this journal; 118 bibliographies and lists of references; 176 reviews of 140 different works; 62 abstracts for *Social Science Abstracts*; 12 biographical notes; 3 guides for courses in agricultural history; 47 historical sketches and notes for use in courses in agricultural

history, in answering requests for information, and in preparing radio scripts, Department of Agriculture press releases, etc.; 8 unpublished papers prepared for presentation at meetings and for other purposes; a pamphlet for the Armed Services on farming as an occupation; and the foreword to a recently published history of agricultural economics. Of these items, 354 are listed in the present bibliography.

The bibliography has been prepared with two objectives in mind. First, insofar as is possible to do so by a list of printed and processed works, it presents a summarization of Edwards' lifework. Second, it is a delineation of the development of Edwards' interests, noting, however, that the course of his work was often dictated by the demands of his position. With these objectives in mind, the works have been arranged chronologically according to the earliest known date of public presentation. This type of arrangement, incidentally, was favored by Edwards and was used in all of his bibliographies of the works of one man.

1927

*Outline and Required and Suggested Readings in History of American Agriculture, Graduate School, United States Department of Agriculture, 1927-28. 23 p., mimeographed [Washington, D. C., 1927]. Revised as, Outline and List of Readings for the Course in the History of American Agriculture, Graduate School, United States*

*Department of Agriculture*. 25 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., 1931. And as, *A Guide for Courses in the History of American Agriculture*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 35, viii, 192 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., September 1939.

## 1928

Abstracts for *Social Science Abstracts*.

During the years 1928-1932 62 abstracts of contemporary articles were prepared for *Social Science Abstracts*.

*Agricultural History*. Vols. 2-25, Washington, D. C., Agricultural History Society. January 1928-October 1951.

The Agricultural History Society was organized in 1919 to promote interest, study and research in the history of agriculture. In January 1927, the Society inaugurated *Agricultural History*, its quarterly journal, as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases. Each number has a News Notes and Comments section in which current books and articles of interest and value to workers in the subject of agricultural history are cited. Editorial paragraphs on activities of interest to this group are also included.

Everett E. Edwards began to assist with the editing of *Agricultural History* as early as the number for January 1928. His name is carried as assistant editor for the first time in the October 1928 number and as editor from October 1931 through October 1951. The following are examples of the kind of editorial comment which he prepared: "Agricultural History at North Dakota Agricultural College," 9: 162 (July 1935). "Agricultural History in Texas," 5: 129-130 (July 1931). "Charles Read's Notes on Colonial Agriculture," 8: 35-36 (January 1934). "A Chinese Agricultural Library," 3: 186-187 (October 1929). "Columbia University Studies in the History of American Agriculture," 6: 157-158 (July 1932). "The Daniel Parrish Witter Agricultural Museum," 4: 74-75 (April 1930). "A Future Agricultural History Source," 7: 207 (October 1933). "Natural Land-Use Areas and Types-of-Farming Maps," 8: 146-147 (July 1934). "Prehistoric Agriculture in America," 10: 91 (April 1936). "Seventy-fifth Anniversary [of the Act Establishing the U. S. Department of Agriculture]," 12: 96 (January 1938). "A Social Survey of an Agricultural Region," 2: 218-219 (October 1928).

*General Accounts and Summaries of the History of Agriculture in the United States*. 3 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Dec. 1, 1928; revised Feb. 1, 1929; and, 6 p., Aug. 1, 1930. Revised as *The History of Agriculture in the United States: A Brief List of Annotated References*. 8 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture,

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Jan. 1, 1931. As, *References on the History of Agriculture in the United States*. 11 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Jan. 1, 1933; revised, 10 p., Oct. 1, 1933; and, 13 p., September 1934. Revised as, *Selected References on the History of Agriculture in the United States*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 26, v, 28 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., November 1935; and, edition 2, v, 43 p., January 1939.

"This list of selected references was prepared primarily for those who need citations of articles and books that afford convenient summaries of the main facts concerning the history of agriculture in the United States or of some major period of this subject. It is not a guide to the many articles and monographs on specific phases of the subject. . . ."—Preface.

REVIEWS: Sir William Ashley, *The Bread of Our Forefathers* (Oxford, 1928), in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 10: 555-556 (October 1928); R. H. Gabriel, *Toilers of Land and Sea* (New Haven, 1926), in *Agricultural History*, 2: 35-36 (January 1928); H. F. James, *The Agricultural Industry of Southeastern Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1928), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 2: 249-250 (October 1928); W. W. Jennings, *Sketches in European Economic History* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1927), in *ibid.*, 2: 323-324 (December 1928); M. M. Knight, H. E. Barnes, and Felix Flügel, *Economic History of Europe in Modern Times* (Boston, 1928), in *ibid.*, 2: 129-130 (May 1928); M. M. Knight, *Economic History of Europe to the End of the Middle Ages* (London, 1926), in *ibid.*, 2: 129-130 (May 1928); E. S. Mead and Bernhard Ostrolenk, *Harvey Baum: A Study of the Agricultural Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1928), in *ibid.*, 2: 247-249 (October 1928); G. J. Miller and A. E. Parkins, *Geography of North America* (New York, 1928), in *ibid.*, 2: 201-202 (September 1928); G. Renard and G. Weulersse, *Life and Work in Modern Europe (Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries)*, translated by Margaret Richards (New York, 1926), in *ibid.*, 2: 281 (November 1928).

## 1929

REVIEWS: Paul De Kruif, *Hunger Fighters* (New York, 1928), in *Agricultural History*, 3: 39-40 (January 1929); J. A. Hopkins, Jr., *Economic History of the Production of Beef Cattle in Iowa* (Iowa City, 1928), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 3: 119-120 (April 1929); E. S. Osgood, *The Day of the Cattleman* (Minneapolis, 1929), in *ibid.*, 3: 239-240 (September 1929), and in *Agricultural History*, 3: 37 (January 1929); A. C. True, *A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923* (Washington, 1928), in *ibid.*, 3: 40-41 (January 1929); A. C. True, *A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-*

1925 (Washington, 1929), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 3: 342-343 (November 1929).

## 1930

*Agriculture in the Life of the Nation; A Selected List of References*. 4 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Aug. 1, 1930. Revised, 8 p., Mar. 1, 1931; and as, *References on Agriculture in the Life of the Nation*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 34, v, 73 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., January 1939.

*A Bibliography of the History of Agriculture in the United States*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication 84, iv, 307 p. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1930.

Contents: Generalities (American histories, a selected list; interpretations of American history; scope of the history of American agriculture; bibliographies; annual reports and yearbooks; current articles and books), p. 1-11. Geographic factors in American history (general; physiography; soils; climate), p. 12-20. Indian contributions to American agriculture, p. 21-31. Colonization and settlement in America, p. 32-50. Land policies and the public domain, p. 50-59. Agriculture: general historical summaries, p. 59-61. Agriculture in the colonial period, p. 61-66. Agriculture from the American Revolution to the Civil War, p. 66-72. Agriculture and the sectional struggle, p. 72-74. Agricultural revolution, p. 74-75. Agriculture by regions and commodities, chiefly since 1860, p. 75-104. Agriculture in the States, p. 104-168. Agriculture during the World War, p. 168-170. The agricultural problem, analyses and proposed solutions, p. 170-177. Agricultural cooperative movement, p. 177-181. Agriculture in the life of the nation, p. 181-184. Transportation and markets (colonial period; roads and trails, river and canal transportation; trade and markets, 1775-1860; transportation since 1860; domestic and foreign markets since 1860), p. 185-199. Farm implements and machinery, p. 199-204. Agencies promoting agriculture (U. S. Department of Agriculture and other Federal Agencies; State departments of agriculture; agricultural education; agricultural periodicals; agricultural fairs; agricultural societies), p. 204-218. Agricultural leaders, p. 218-233. Federal, regional, and State projects designed to aid agriculture, p. 233-239. Farmers and political activity since the American Revolution (Confederation period; farmers and Constitution of 1787; Federalist regime; Jeffersonianism in power, 1801-1829; Jacksonian democracy in power; increased sectional tension, 1850-1860; Liberal Republican movement; Granger movement; Greenback movement; Farmers' Alliance; Populist movement; Progressive movement; National Nonpartisan League; agricultural bloc; farm-relief legislation; McNary-Haugenism; election of 1928;

export debenture; the tariff), p. 239-281. Index, p. 283-307.

For this bibliography, the compiler was awarded the fourth biennial prize of the Eunice Rockwood Oberly Memorial Fund. See the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, *Newsletter* (n.s.), 1(4):3 (Apr. 18, 1931); *B.A.E. News*, 24(17):2-3 (Apr. 28, 1931); "Oberly Prize to B.A.E. Man for Agricultural Bibliography," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Official Record*, 10: 156 (May 16, 1931); *Washington Times*, May 9, 1931; *Carletonian* (Northfield, Minn.), Feb. 7, 1931, p. 4.

Reviewed by: R. H. Anderson, in *American Journal of Sociology*, 37: 848 (March 1932); M. L. Becker, in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, 7: 573 (Jan. 31, 1931); T. C. Blegen, in *Minnesota History*, 12: 90 (March 1931); O.D.D., in *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 12: 192 (September 1931); Joseph Schafer, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 14: 332 (March 1931); *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 5: 20 (January 1931); and *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 38: 335-336 (June 1931).

"Historical Background of the Present Situation in Southern Agriculture," in Southeastern Economic Association, *Proceedings* (1930), 3: 78-93.

An address before a session of the third annual meeting of the Southeastern Economic Association at Atlanta, Georgia, on Nov. 14 and 15, 1930. Mimeographed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture with the same title.

*Memorandum Concerning the Campaigns in 1905, 1915, 1921, and 1927 to Decrease the Cotton Acreage*. 7 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Jan. 31, 1930.

REVIEWS: E. E. Dale, *The Range Cattle Industry* (Norman, Okla., 1930), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 4: 461-463 (November 1930), and in *Agricultural History*, 4: 152-154 (October 1930); J. F. Dobie, *A Vaquero of the Brush Country* (Dallas, Tex., 1929), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 4: 262-263 (June 1930); P. R. Fossum, "Early Milling in the Cannon River Valley," *Minnesota History*, 11: 271-282 (September 1930), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 4: 510 (November 1930); Pierre Hoffman and Jules Deboffe, *Blanchisserie et teinturerie de Theon* (Paris, 1929), in *ibid.*, 4: 316 (September 1930); A. B. Hulbert, *Soil: Its Influence on the History of the United States with Special Reference to Migration and the Scientific Study of Local History* (New Haven, 1930), in *ibid.*, 4: 522-523 (December 1930); C. S. Orwin, *The Reclamation of Exmoor Forest* (London, 1929), in *ibid.*, 4: 90-91 (March 1930); A. G. Peterson, *Historical Study of Prices Received by Producers of Farm Products in Virginia, 1801-1927* (Blacksburg, Va., 1930), in *Agricultural History*, 4: 121 (July 1930); Walter Simons,



Albrecht Thaer; nach amtlichen und privaten Dokumenten aus einer grossen Zeit (Berlin, 1926), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 4: 309-310 (September 1930), and in *Agricultural History*, 5: 25-26 (January 1931); J. F. Willard and C. B. Goodykoontz, ed., *The Trans-Mississippi West* (Boulder, Colo., 1930), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 4: 463-464 (November 1930).

## 1931

*George Washington and Agriculture; A Classified List of Annotated References with an Introductory Note*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 22, vi, 25 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., September 1931. Edition 2, v, 77 p., February 1936.

Contents of edition 2: Introductory note, p. 1-3; Washington's agricultural writings, p. 4-11; Washington's farming activities, p. 12-32; Mount Vernon, Washington's home, p. 33-48; Washington and western land, p. 49-62; Washington's interest in internal improvements, p. 63-71; Index, p. 72-77.

The first edition of this bibliography on George Washington and Agriculture was issued in September 1931 in anticipation of requests for information on the subject incident to the celebration of the bicentenary of Washington's birth. The demand for copies . . . has demonstrated the usefulness of the compilation, not only for its original purpose but also as a source of references on general agricultural conditions during the last half of the eighteenth century."—Preface.

Reviewed by: *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 38: 887-888 (December 1931).

"George Washington, Farmer; A List of Annotated References and a Brief Introduction," in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 6: 59-67 (March-April 1931).

The "brief introduction" is essentially the same as the Introductory Note of *George Washington and Agriculture* (1931) and the "list of annotated references" consists of items selected from those listed in that publication under the headings, "Washington's Agricultural Writings" and "Washington's Farming Activities."

*Lincoln's Attitude toward Farm Problems*. 3 p., mimeographed. [Washington, D. C., 1931]. Revised, in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 6: 29-33 (February 1931). Revised, 4 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Dec. 15, 1933.

This paper was originally prepared and presented as a radio talk, delivered through WRC and 39 other radio stations associated with the National Broadcasting Company, Feb. 12, 1931. The revisions included references.

*A List of American Economic Histories*. 8 p., mimeographed. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of

Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C., October 1931. Revised, 17 p., September 1934. Revised, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 27, iii, 25 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., November 1935; and, as edition 2, iii, 43 p., April 1939.

This list of American economic histories was prepared primarily for those who need citations of books that afford convenient summaries of the main facts concerning the economic history of the United States.

REVIEWS: G. J. S. Broomhall and J. H. Hubback, *Corn Trade Memories; Recent and Remote* (Liverpool, 1930), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 5: 61 (February 1931); D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (ed. 11, New York, 1931), in *ibid.*, 5: 592 (December 1931); G. E. Fussell, "Population and Wheat Production in the Eighteenth Century," *History Teachers' Miscellany*, 7: 65-68, 84-88, 108-111, 120-127 (May-August 1929), in *ibid.*, 5: 114 (March 1931); G. W. Hendry, "The Adobe Brick as a Historical Source; Reporting Further Studies in Adobe Brick Analysis," *Agricultural History*, 5: 110-127 (July 1931) in *ibid.*, 5: 429 (September 1931); H. J. Hewitt, *Mediaeval Cheshire* (Manchester, 1929), in *ibid.*, 5: 529-530 (November 1931); *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, by Twelve Southerners (New York and London, 1930), in *ibid.*, 5: 65 (February 1931); H. W. Odum, *An American Epoch: Southern Portraiture in the National Picture* (New York 1930), in *ibid.*, 5: 126 (March 1931); U. B. Phillips, "Plantations East and South of Suez," *Agricultural History*, 5: 93-109 (July 1931), in *ibid.*, 5: 444 (September 1931); P. S. Taylor, "Historical Note on Dimmit County, Texas," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, 34: 79-90 (October 1930), in *ibid.*, 5: 334 (June 1931); C. F. Ware, *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture* (Boston and New York, 1931), in *ibid.*, 5: 230-231 (May 1931); C. R. Woodward, *Agriculture in New Jersey* (New York, 1930), in *ibid.*, 5: 231 (May 1931).

## 1932

*Agriculture of the American Indians; A Classified List of Annotated Historical References with an Introduction*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 23, xi, 89 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., May 1932. Edition 2, xii, 106 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., June 1933. Revised (with Wayne D. Rasmussen) as, *A Bibliography on the Agriculture of the American Indians*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication 447. 107 p., Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1942.

Contents: Preface, p. v; Introduction, p. 1-5; Comprehensive histories, p. 7-13; Agriculture of the American Indians (Comprehensive references, Agriculture of particular regions and tribes, Specific crops and animals, Agriculture on Indian reservations in the United States), p. 64-77; Uncultivated plants used by the

American Indians (Food and industrial plants, Medicinal plants), p. 78-96; Index, p. 97.

Reviewed by: *B.A.E. News*, 27(1): 8 (July 6, 1932); W. E. Ekblaw, in *Economic Geography*, 8: 432 (October 1932); *Minnesota History*, 13: 330 (September 1932); Frederick Starr, in *Unity*, Feb. 13, 1933; and [Joseph] S[chafer], in *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 16: 341 (March 1933).

"An Annotated Bibliography on the Materials, the Scope, and the Significance of American Agricultural History," in *Agricultural History*, 6: 38-43 (January 1932). Mimeographed version, *References on the Materials for American Agricultural History*. 7 p., mimeographed. [Washington, D. C.], U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, January 1932. Revised as, *References on Agricultural History as a Field of Research and Study*. 8 p., November 1934. Revised as, *References on Agricultural History as a Field for Research*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 32, v, 41 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., December 1937.

Contents: References, p. 1-34; Chronology, p. 35-38; Index, p. 39-41.

"This bibliography pertains to agricultural history as a field for research and study. Special attention has been given to references on the scope and significance of American agricultural history, references that relate to sources of special interest to research workers in agricultural history and the steps that are being taken to collect these sources, and references that describe special methods of research utilized by agricultural historians."—Preface.

"Farmers' Account Books, Diaries, etc., Are often Valuable Research Aids," in U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1932, p. 197-200, illus. Revised as, "Importance of Preserving Historical Records for Agricultural Research," in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 8: 185-188 (December 1933). Expanded as, "The Need of Historical Materials for Agricultural Research," in *Agricultural History*, 9: 3-11 (January 1935). Also issued in mimeographed form with the same title (Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, January 1935. 8 p., mimeographed). Quoted at length in "Agricultural Records in the Baker Library," in the Business Historical Society, *Bulletin*, 9: 60-63 (June 1935). Revised as, "Agricultural Records; Their Nature and Value for Research," in *Agricultural History*, 13: 1-12 (January 1939).

This paper (last revision) was presented at the session on "Special Type Archives" of the second annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, at Springfield, Ill., on Oct. 26, 1938.

"George Washington and Agriculture," in *Minnesota Horticulture*, 60(2): 25 (February 1932).

A reprinting of the Introduction, p. v-vi, of *George Washington and Agriculture* (1931).

"George Washington, the Farmer," in the *Loudoun-Fauquier Magazine*, 3(2): 9, 49, illus. (Spring 1932).

A revision of the Introduction, p. v-vi, of *George Washington and Agriculture* (1931).

"George Washington Preferred Farming to Duties as Soldier and Statesman," U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Information, Press Service release, 5 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., Apr. 17, 1932.

This release was printed with the same title in the *Valley Farmer and South Texas Grower*, 5(13): 8 (Apr. 5, 1932); with the title, "George Washington—the Farmer," in the *Southern Planter*, 93(10): 5 (May 15, 1932); and with the title, "Washington Was One of the Best Farmers of His Day," in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Official Record*, 11: 188 (Aug. 27, 1932).

REVIEWS: C. H. Ambler, *A History of Transportation in the Ohio Valley* (Glendale, Calif., 1932), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 6: 129 (March 1932); Isaiah Bowman, *The Pioneer Fringe* (New York, 1931), in *ibid.*, 6: 271-272 (May 1932); J. D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), in *ibid.*, 6: 4-5 (January 1932); S. K. Humphrey, *Following the Prairie Frontier* (Minneapolis, 1931), in *Rural America*, 10(3): 14 (March 1932); Leo Rogin, *The Introduction of Farm Machinery in its Relation to the Productivity of Labor in the Agriculture of the United States during the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley, Calif., 1931), in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 14: 514-515 (July 1932); E. C. Semple, *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region* (New York, 1931), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 6: 130 (March 1932), and in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 14: 713-714 (October 1932); H. O. Severance, *The Story of a Village Community* (New York, 1931), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 6: 89 (February 1932); W. P. Webb, *The Great Plains* (Boston, 1931), in *ibid.*, 6: 350-351 (June 1932), and in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 14: 714-715 (October 1932).

### 1933

"Ellen Churchill Semple," in *Agricultural History*, 7: 150-152 (July 1933).

"Minnesota Agricultural Progress," in the *Minnesota Alumni Weekly*, 32: 525-526 (June 3, 1933).

This article is the same as the radio talk, "The Story of Agriculture in Minnesota," presented over the University of Minnesota station, Mar. 16, 1933. Reprinted with the title, "Farming and Stock Raising Non-existent in Minnesota as Vocation prior to '40," in the St. Paul Sunday *Pioneers Press* (Diamond Jubilee history no.), Dec. 31, 1933, p. 4b.

REVIEWS: Avery Craven, *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner* (New York, 1932), in *Agricultural History*, 7: 203-205 (October 1933); L. C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860* (Washington, 1933), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 7: 194 (April 1933), and in *Agricultural History*, 7: 96 (April

1933); A. M. Sakolski, *The Great American Land Bubble* (New York, 1932), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 7: 249-250 (May 1933); J. K. Wright, ed., *New England's Prospect: 1933* (New York, 1933), in *ibid.*, 7: 189-190 (April 1933); and in *Agricultural History*, 7: 208-209 (October 1933).

## 1934

"American Indian Contributions to Civilization," in *Minnesota History*, 15: 255-272 (September 1934).

A paper presented on July 14, 1934, at the Shakopee session of the twelfth state historical convention held under the auspices of the Minnesota Historical Society. The paper was reviewed in an editorial entitled "Indians and Agriculture," *Minneapolis Star*, July 20, 1934.

Summarized with same title in *Scholastic*, 29(6): 16 (Oct. 24, 1936).

"Archer Butler Hulbert," in *Agricultural History*, 8: 143-144 (July 1934).

"A Bibliography of the Writings of Professor Ulrich Bonnell Phillips," in *Agricultural History*, 8: 196-218 (October 1934).

Contents: Introduction, by Fred Landon, p. 196-199; Articles, p. 199-209; Books, p. 209-213; Book reviews, p. 213-216; Edited works, p. 216-218.

James Cleghorn, *On the Depressed State of Agriculture; An Essay Published by Order of the Highland Society of Scotland, 1822*. Foreword by Everett E. Edwards. 66 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1934.

"Periam, Jonathan (Feb. 17, 1823-Dec. 9, 1911), agricultural writer and horticulturist . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 14: 463-464 (New York, 1934).

*References on the Handicrafts of the Southern Highlanders*. 22 p., mimeographed. (Washington, D. C.), U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, February 1934.

REVIEWS: C. H. Ambler, *A History of West Virginia* (New York, 1933), in *Agricultural History*, 8: 225-226 (October 1934); B. W. Bond, Jr., *The Civilization of the Old Northwest* (New York, 1934), in *ibid.*, 8: 224-225 (October 1934); Ernest Brehaut, *Calo the Censor on Farming* (New York, 1933), in *ibid.*, 8: 138 (July 1934); H. J. Carman and R. G. Tugwell, eds., *Essays upon Field Husbandry in New England, and Other Papers, 1748-1762*, by Jared Eliot (New York, 1934), in *ibid.*, 8: 223-224 (October 1934); G. B. Cressey, *China's Geographic Foundation* (New York, 1934), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 8: 665-666 (November 1934); E. H. Roseboom and F. P. Weisenburger, *A History of Ohio* (New York, 1934), in *Agricultural History*, 8: 225 (October 1934); H. J. Thornton, *The History of the Quaker Oats Company* (Chicago,

1933), in *ibid.*, 8: 140 (July 1934); W. L. Westermann and E. S. Hasenobel, eds., *Zenon Papyri; Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. dealing with Palestine and Egypt* (New York, 1934), in *ibid.*, 8: 223 (October 1934).

## 1935

*References on the Mountaineers of the Southern Appalachians*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 28, v, 148 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., December 1935.

Contents: General references (articles, books), p. 1-23; Occupations (economic and social survey of the Southern Appalachians, agriculture, handicrafts—general and specific organizations, mills, mining), p. 23-56; Social conditions (social betterment activities—general and church activities, education—general references, specific institutions and topics, public health—general references, Frontier Nursing Service, Inc., feuds), p. 57-103; Folklore and folk songs (articles, collections of folk songs, White Top Mountain Folk Festival, dialect), p. 104-122; Addendum, p. 123-129; Index, p. 130-148.

*References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 25, vii, 63 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., October 1935. Edition 2, v, 99 p., April 1939.

"The influence of the historical interpretation known as the frontier hypothesis on discussions of present conditions in the United States and the fact that historians have in recent years been reexamining its tenets and ramifications have led to the preparation of this compilation on the significance of the frontier in American history. It is hoped that it will prove a useful tool in furthering real comprehension of the past, the present, and the future."—Preface, first edition.

Reviewed by: G. L. N[ute], in *Minnesota History*, 17: 198 (June 1936); and *Pacific Historical Review*, (December 1935).

"Reid, James L. (Dec. 26, 1844-June 1, 1910), corn breeder . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 15: 447-478 (New York, 1935).

"Scovell, Melville Amasa (Feb. 26, 1855-Aug. 15, 1912), agricultural chemist and educator . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 16: 512-513 (New York, 1935).

*Selected References on the History of English Agriculture*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 24, vi, 42 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., July 1935. Edition 2, v, 107 p., October 1939.

Contents (edition 2): Bibliographies, p. 1-14; Geography and Contemporary Scene, p. 15-28; Histories, p. 29-94; Index, p. 95-112.

"The agricultural history of the United States is more closely related to that of Great Britain than to



that of any other country. Our colonial forefathers brought with them the rural customs and practices of the Mother Country, and we as a Nation continued through the nineteenth century to look mainly to England for leadership and example in agricultural improvement. These facts, in addition to an interest in the subject itself, have consciously or unconsciously prompted the requests for information which have resulted in the preparation of this list of references on the history of English agriculture.

"The references in this list have been selected from an extensive unpublished bibliography in the compiler's files. Availability and utility have been factors in the choice of titles to be included. As indicated in the table of contents the list is divided into two parts: (1) a short group of bibliographies; (2) histories devoted exclusively or in part to English agricultural history. The citations are extensively annotated with excerpts from the prefaces indicating the point of view and purpose of the authors and quotations from reviews indicating their value."—Preface (edition 1).

Reviewed by: G. E. Fussell, in *Economic History Review*, 6(1): 112 (October 1935), and *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 42: 524-525 (September 1935); and Marc Bloch, in *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale*, 8: 615 (Nov. 30, 1936).

"Spillman, William Jasper (Oct. 23, 1863-July 11, 1931), scientist, agricultural economist . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 17: 458-459 (New York, 1935).

REVIEW: W. C. Neely, *The Agricultural Fair* (New York, 1935), in *Minnesota History*, 16: 327-328 (September 1935), and in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 9: 658 (October 1935).

### 1936

"Middle Western Agricultural History as a Field of Research," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 24: 315-328 (December 1937).

"This paper was presented at the joint session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association with the American Historical Association at Providence, Rhode Island, on Dec. 29, 1936."—footnote 1.

*References on Agricultural Museums*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 29, v, 43 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., August 1936.

Contents: General references on museums (bibliographies, directories, and manuals, utility of museums), p. 1-9; References on agricultural museums (comprehensive references, references by countries), p. 10-40; Index, p. 41-43.

"Presenting the evolution of agriculture in an agricultural museum is an important means of preserving, recording, and depicting the subject for the enlightenment of the present and future generations. In view of this fact, the references on agricultural museums that

have accumulated during my search for material relating to the history of agriculture would seem to be of sufficient interest to justify their being issued as a separate bibliography. It is hoped that they will interest many in agricultural museums and perhaps encourage the organization of a larger number of them. . . ."—Preface.

*References on Economic History as a Field of Research and Study*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 31, v, 83 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., October 1936.

Contents: Economic history as a field of research and study, p. 1-47; Economic interpretation of history, p. 48-68; Periodicals devoted to economic history, p. 69-72; Chronology, p. 73-78; Index, p. 79-83.

"The close nexus between agricultural and economic history results inevitably in the examination of the latter as a field of research and study when the methods and materials for the former are under consideration. It is believed, therefore, that this bibliography will be of service to economic historians and even to economists and historians generally as well as to those who are primarily interested in agricultural history."—Preface.

*References on the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Waterway Project* (with Edith J. Lowe), U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 30, v, 185 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., October 1936.

Contents: Bibliographies, p. 1-2; General background references, p. 3-7; Documents (Canada, United States, State and Provincial), p. 8-20; Books and pamphlets, p. 21-37; Articles, p. 38-143; Special topics (Georgian Bay canal, Lake levels problem, Sault Ste. Marie canal, Welland canal), p. 144-175; Index, p. 176-185.

"A list entitled 'References on the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence River Project' (53 p., typewritten) was prepared in November 1932. . . . The continued interest of the general public in the subject has prompted the compilation of the present bibliography. . . ."—Preface.

"References on Johnny Appleseed," *Agricultural Library Notes*, 11: 270-279 (May 1936).

"Sturtevant, Edward Lewis (Jan. 23, 1842-July 30, 1898), agricultural scientist . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 18: 185-186 (New York, 1936).

"True, Alfred Charles (June 5, 1853-Apr. 23, 1929), leader in agricultural education . . .," in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 19: 4 (New York, 1936).

REVIEWS: G. E. Fussell, "The First 18th Century English Book on Cattle," *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 42: 1235-1243 (March 1936), in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 11: 219-220 (April 1936); H. A. Kellar, ed., *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist*:



*Selected Writings*, vol. 1, 1825-1845 (Indiana Historical Collections, vol. 21. Indianapolis, 1936), in *Minnesota History*, 17: 326-327 (September 1936), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 10: 441 (June 1936), and in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 11: 336 (June 1936); Fred Landon, "The Agricultural Journals of Upper Canada," *Agricultural History*, 9: 167-175 (October 1935), in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 11: 111 (February 1936); Louis Pelzer, *The Cattlemen's Frontier* (Glendale, Calif., 1936), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 10: 760-761 (November 1936); Eileen Power, "On the Need for a New Edition of Walter of Henley," Royal Historical Society, *Transactions*, 17(series 4): 101-116 (London, 1934), in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 11: 219-220 (April 1936).

## 1937

"Some Sources for Northwest History; Agricultural Periodicals," *Minnesota History*, 18: 407-414 (December 1937).

"T. L. Haecker, the Father of Dairying in Minnesota," *Minnesota History*, 19: 148-161 (June 1938).

This paper was presented at the joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association at Philadelphia on December 29, 1937. The background and interpretation are based on extensive research in the history of dairying in the Northwest. Many of the data here used were further substantiated by an interview with Professor Haecker on August 14, 1937.—footnote 1.

Translated as, "T. L. Häcker, der Vater des Molke-reiwesens in Minnesota," in *Tägliche Volkszeitung*, 30 Nov. 1938, Seite 2.

*Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Agriculture*. vi, 102 p., illus. [Washington, D. C.], U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, November 1937.

Contents: Washington and agriculture, p. 1-36; Jefferson and agriculture, p. 37-72; Lincoln and agriculture, p. 73-90; Agricultural laws of 1862, p. 91-102.

"The year 1937 marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United States Department of Agriculture and the passage of the Land Grant College Act, both approved by President Lincoln in 1862. It thus becomes the occasion for retrospective and prospective views of American agriculture.

"A collection of the observations on agriculture by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, three leaders eminent in American history, is, therefore, of especial interest at this time. The selections here included present the views of these leaders on the place of agriculture in the life of the Nation, their farming experiences, and the contemporaneous agricultural conditions.

"Everett E. Edwards is responsible for the selections and the introductory notes."—Foreword.

REVIEWS: T. P. Abernethy, *Western Lands and the*

*American Revolution* (New York, 1937), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 11: 1018-1019 (December 1937); J. B. Holt, *German Agricultural Policy, 1918-1934* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936), in *American Historical Review*, 42: 829 (July 1937); H. A. Kellar, ed., *Solon Robinson: Pioneer and Agriculturist: Selected Writings*, vol. 2, 1846-1851 (Indiana Historical Collections, vol. 22, Indianapolis, 1936), in *Minnesota History*, 18: 195-196 (June 1937); Joseph Schafer, *The Social History of American Agriculture* (New York, 1936), in *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, 28: 199-200 (April 1937); W. E. Tate, *Parliamentary Land Enclosures in the County of Nottingham during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 1743-1868* (Thoroton Society Record series, vol. 5, Nottingham, 1935), in *Economic History Review*, 8: 104-105 (November 1937); H. F. Wilson, *The Hill Country of Northern New England* (New York, 1936), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 11: 402-403 (May 1937).

## 1938

"A Bibliography of the Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner and References on His Life and Work," in *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, p. 233-272 (Madison, 1938).

Contents: Bibliography of the writings of Frederick Jackson Turner, p. 233-268; References on the Life and work of Frederick Jackson Turner, p. 269-272.

*References on American Colonial Agriculture*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library, Bibliographical Contributions 33, v, 101 p., mimeographed. Washington, D. C., September 1938.

Contents: Bibliographies, p. 1-4; Indigenous and foreign contributions (American Indian contributions, English agricultural practices, Dutch influences, French contributions, Spanish contributions), p. 5-16; Agriculture of the Thirteen English Colonies, p. 17-72; Land Policies to 1776, p. 73-90; Index, p. 91-101.

"Wendelin Grimm and Alfalfa" (with Horace H. Russell), *Minnesota History*, 19: 21-33 (March 1938).

"This paper was presented at the afternoon session of the eighty-ninth annual meeting of the Minnesota Historical Society in St. Paul on January 10, 1938. In the absence of the authors, it was read by their friend, Mr. Rodney C. Loehr at St. Paul."—footnote 1.

A German translation of this article appeared with the title, "Wendelin Grimm und Alfalfa," in *Tägliche Volkszeitung*, 30 Nov. 1938, zweite sektion, Seite 2, 3.

REVIEWS: Everett Dick, *The Sod-House Frontier, 1854-1890* (New York, 1937), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 12: 86-88 (February 1938); John Ise, *Sod and Stubble; the Story of a Kansas Homestead* (New York, 1938), in *ibid.*, 12: 811 (October 1938); Naomi Riches, *The Agricultural Revolution in Norfolk* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1937), in *ibid.*, 12: 311-312 (April 1938); C. V. Woodward, *Tom Watson, Agrarian Rebel* (New York, 1938), in *ibid.*, 12: 661 (September 1938).

## 1939

REVIEWS: R. C. Loehr, ed., *Minnesota Farmers' Diaries: William R. Brown, 1845-46; Mitchell Y. Jackson, 1852-63*. With an introduction and notes by R. C. Loehr. (Minnesota Historical Society, Publications, Narratives and Documents, vol. 3. Saint Paul, 1939), in *Minnesota History*, 20: 417-418 (December 1939), and *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 14: 339 (April 1940); Russell Lord, *Behold Our Land* (Boston, 1938), in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 25: 587-588 (March 1939); J. C. Robert, *The Tobacco Kingdom: Plantation, Market, and Factory in Virginia and North Carolina, 1800-1860* (Durham, N. C., 1938), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 13: 4 (January 1939); Joseph Schafer, *The Winnebago-Horicon Basin: A Type Study in Western History* (Wisconsin Domesday Book, General Studies, Vol. 4, Madison, 1937), in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 25: 569-570 (March 1939); *Sketch of the History of the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture—Memoirs 6* (Philadelphia, 1939), in *Agricultural Library Notes*, 14: 536-537 (September 1939).

## 1940

"American Agriculture—The First 300 Years," in U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1940, p. 171-276.

"Agricultural History and the Department of Agriculture," *Agricultural History*, 16: 129-136 (July 1942).

This paper was presented in slightly condensed form as the presidential address at the annual meeting of the Agricultural History Society, Washington, D. C., June 6, 1940.

REVIEWS: H. J. Carman, ed., *American Husbandry* (New York, 1939), in *Journal of Southern History*, 6: 549-550 (November 1940), and in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 27: 459-460 (December 1940); D. W. Malott and B. F. Martin, *The Agricultural Industries* (New York and London, 1939), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 14: 10-11 (January 1940).

## 1941

"Agricultural History as a Field of Research," in Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1941, p. 15-22.

This paper was presented at the joint session of the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Political Science Association at Kingston, Ontario, on May 22, 1941.

REVIEWS: Andrew Boss, *The Early History and Background of the School of Agriculture at University Farm, St. Paul* (1941), in *Minnesota History*, 22: 412-413 (December 1941); A. L. Demaree, *The American Agricultural Press, 1819-1860* (New York, 1941), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 15: 340-341 (April 1941), and in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 28:

265-266 (September 1941); E. N. Dick, *Vanguards of the Frontier* (New York and London, 1941), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 15: 709-710 (September 1941); Irving Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711-1775* (New York, 1940), in *ibid.*, 15: 6 (January 1941), and in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 66: 114 (January 1942); P. M. Spurlin, *Montesquieu in America, 1760-1801* (University, La., 1940), in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 28: 297 (September 1941); C. R. Woodward, *Ploughs and Politics: Charles Read and His Notes on Agriculture, 1715-1774* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1941), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 15: 1017-1018 (November 1941), in *American Historical Review*, 47: 879-880 (July 1942), and in *Journal of Economic History*, 2: 95-96 (May 1942).

## 1942

"Bibliography of the Writings of Joseph Schafer" (with Thomas J. Mayock), in *Joseph Schafer: Student of Agriculture*, p. 33-66 (Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1942).

"Compiling History as We Live It," in *Land Policy Review*, 5(8): 22-24 (Winter 1942).

"Rural Communities and the American Pattern," American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1942, 3: 353-359.

A version of this paper was prepared for presentation at the joint session of the American Association for State and Local History with the American Historical Association that was to have been held at Columbus, Ohio, on Dec. 29, 1942.

"Selected References on the History of Livestock Raising in the United States to 1860. Published since the Thompson Manuscript was completed," in James Westfall Thompson, *A History of Livestock Raising in the United States, 1607-1860*, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Agricultural History Series 5, p. 178-182 (Washington, D. C., 1942).

REVIEWS: E. E. Dale, *Cow Country* (Norman, Okla., 1942), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 16: 447 (June 1942); Shaw Livermore, *Early American Land Companies: Their Influence on Corporate Development* (New York, 1939), in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 24: 914-915 (November 1942); W. C. Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration, 1917-1919* (Stanford University, Calif., 1942), in *Land Policy Review*, 5(6): 35-36 (June 1942); R. M. Robbins, *Our Landed Heritage: The Public Domain, 1778-1936* (Princeton, 1942), in *Agricultural Economics Literature*, 16: 279-280 (April 1942), and in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 25: 521-522 (May 1943).

## 1943

(Editor, with Fulmer Mood) "Frederick Jackson Turner's History of the Grignon Tract on the Portage

of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers," *Agricultural History*, 17: 113-120 (April 1943).

*Jefferson and Agriculture: A Sourcebook in Commemoration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson*, U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Agricultural History Series 7. 84 p. Washington, D. C., 1943.

Reviewed by: Earle D. Ross, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 30: 610 (March 1944).

"Latin American Gifts: The Potato," *Agriculture in the Americas*, 3: 99 (May 1943).

REVIEWS: *British Agriculture: The Principles of Future Policy; A Report of an Enquiry Organized by Viscount Astor and B. Seaborn Rowntree* (London, 1938), in *Political Science Quarterly*, 58: 124-127 (March 1943); Lloyd Lewis, John S. Wright: *Prophet of the Prairies* (Chicago, 1941), in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 30: 108-109 (June 1943).

#### 1944

"Objectives for the Agricultural History Society During Its Second Twenty-Five Years," *Agricultural History*, 18: 187-192 (October 1944).

"Rodney H. True and His Writings," *Agricultural History*, 18: 23-34 (January 1944).

*Selected References on Thomas Jefferson and His Contributions to Agriculture*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Library List 8. 7 p. Washington, D. C., April 1944.

"Silver, Gray (Feb. 17, 1871-July 28, 1935) . . .," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 21 (Sup. 1): 660-661 (New York, 1944).

"Thomas Jefferson and the Public Domain," *Land Policy Review*, 7(2): 25-28 (Summer 1944).

REVIEWS: E. A. Davis, ed., *Plantation Life in the Florida Parishes of Louisiana, 1836-1846, as Reflected in the Diary of Bennet H. Barrow* (New York, 1943), in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 26: 418-419 (May 1944); J. S. Davis, *New International Wheat Agreements* (Food Research Institute, Wheat Studies, vol. 19, no. 2, Stanford University, Calif., Nov. 1942), in *Political Science Quarterly*, 59: 159-160 (March 1944); P. H. Landis, *Population Problems: A Cultural Interpretation* (New York, 1943), in *Social Studies*, 35: 91 (February 1944); M. R. Pabst, *Agricultural Trends in the Connecticut Valley Region of Massachusetts, 1800-1900* (Northampton, Mass., 1941), in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 31: 463-464 (December 1944), and in *New England Quarterly*, 17: 618-619 (December 1944); G. W. Pierson, "American Historians and the Frontier Hypothesis in 1941," *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 26: 36-60, 170-185 (September, December 1942), in Curtis Wiswell Garrison, ed., *The United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature . . .*,

2: 148-150 (Fremont, Ohio, 1944); E. P. Prentice, *Food, War, and the Future* (New York, 1944), in *Land Policy Review*, 7(3): 38 (Fall 1944); U. S. National Archives, *Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the United States Food Administration, 1917-1920: Part 1, The Headquarters Organization* (Washington, 1943), in *American Archivist*, 7: 208-209 (July 1944); J. C. Weaver, "Barley in the United States: A Historical Sketch," *Geographical Review*, 33: 56-73 (January 1943), in Curtis Wiswell Garrison, ed., *The United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature . . .*, 2: 115-116 (Fremont, Ohio, 1944); L. M. Wright, *Peter Melendy: The Mind and Soil* (Iowa City, 1943), in *Minnesota History*, 25: 71 (March 1944).

#### 1945

(Editor). "The National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee: Its Activities and Recommendations," *Agricultural History*, 19: 167-190 (July 1945).

The introduction, p. 167-178, was written by Everett E. Edwards.

*Shall I take up farming?* Prepared for the United States Armed Forces Institute by the American Historical Association. (War Department, Em 35 GI Roundtable). 50 p. Washington, D. C., War Department. Apr. 18, 1945.

(Editor). "The Traits and Contributions of Frederick Jackson Turner," by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, *Agricultural History*, 19: 21-23 (January 1945).

This paper was presented at the joint meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society at Toronto, Canada, on Dec. 28, 1932.

REVIEWS: C. A. Browne, *A Source Book of Agricultural Chemistry* (Chronica Botanica, vol. 8, no. 1, Waltham, Mass., 1944), in *Agricultural History*, 19: 128 (April 1945); M. R. Dickson, *The Food Front in World War I* (Washington, 1944), in *Journal of Economic History*, 5: 265 (November 1945); J. C. Malin, *Winter Wheat in the Golden Belt of Kansas: A Study in Adaption to Subhumid Geographical Environment* (Lawrence, Kans., 1944), in *Agricultural History*, 19: 20 (January 1945), in *Pacific Historical Review*, 14: 225-226 (June 1945), and in *Social Studies*, 36: 231 (May 1945).

#### 1946

Articles for *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

In 1946 and 1947, articles with the following titles were prepared: "Agricultural Organization (in part)," "Agricultural Research," "Agricultural Societies and Shows (in part)," "Agriculture, a General Survey (in part)," "American Farm Bureau Federation," "Arable," "Creameries," "Crops," "Farmers' Clubs," "Farmers' Organizations," "Farmers' Union," "Grange, The," "International Conferences of Agricultural Economists," and "Thrashing or Threshing." These articles

replaced articles with the same titles but by other authors which first appeared in 1929, the first printing of the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

REVIEWS: J. C. Bailey, *Seaman A. Knapp: Schoolmaster of American Agriculture* (New York, 1945), in *New York History*, 27: 249-250 (April 1946), and unsigned review in *Agricultural History*, 20: 128 (April 1946); E. T. Booth, *God Made the Country* (New York, 1946), in *Land Policy Review*, 9(3): 35 (Fall 1946), and in *Agricultural History*, 20: 192 (July 1946); C. J. Brand, *What Economic System for America?* (Washington, 1945), in *ibid.*, 20: 128 (April 1946); E. deS. Brunner, I. T. Sanders, and Douglas Ensminger, eds., *Farmers of the World: The Development of Agricultural Extension* (New York, 1945), in *ibid.*, 20: 128 (April 1946); S. W. Geiser, *Horticulture and Horticulturists in Early Texas* (Dallas, Tex., 1945), in *ibid.*, 20: 190 (July 1946); H. G. Schmidt, *Rural Hunterdon: An Agricultural History* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1945), in *Land Policy Review*, 9(1): 36 (Spring 1946), and in *Agricultural History*, 20: 191 (July 1946); F. A. Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture, 1860-1897* (New York, 1945), in *Journal of Southern History*, 12: 289-291 (May 1946), in *Political Science Quarterly*, 61: 315-316 (June 1946), and in *Agricultural History*, 20: 191 (July 1946); Ward Shepard, *Food or Famine* (New York, 1945), in *ibid.*, 20: 190 (July 1946); C. W. Towne and E. N. Wentworth, *Shepherd's Empire* (Norman, Okla., 1945), in *ibid.*, 20: 191-192 (July 1946), and in *Journal of Economic History*, 6: 224-225 (November 1946); Herbert Weaver, *Mississippi Farmers, 1850-1860* (Nashville, Tenn., 1945), in *Agricultural History*, 20: 190-191 (July 1946).

## 1947

"Agriculture," in *World Book Encyclopedia*, vol. 1 (Chicago, 1947).

REVIEWS: California College of Agriculture, *California Agriculture*, by members of the faculty of the College of Agriculture, University of California, Claude B. Hutchinson, editor (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1946), in *Pacific Historical Review*, 16: 441-443 (November 1947), and in *Agricultural History*, 22: 63-64 (January 1948); H. J. Carman, ed., *Jesse Buel, Agricultural Reformer* (New York, 1947), in *Journal of Farm Economics*, 29: 996-997 (November 1947), in *Land Policy Review*, 10(2): 30 (Summer-Fall 1947), in *Agricultural History*, 22: 64 (January 1948), and in *Journal of Economic History*, 8: 99-100 (May 1948); R. W. Howard, *Two Billion Acre Farm: An Informal History of American Agriculture* (Garden City, N. Y., 1945), in *ibid.*, 7: 105 (May 1947); H. A. Innis, ed., *The Diary of Alexander James McPhail* (Toronto, 1940), in *ibid.*, 7: 253 (November 1947); Iowa State College and Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station Staff, *A Century of Farming in Iowa, 1846-1946* (Ames, 1946), in *Wisconsin*

*Magazine of History*, 31: 208-209 (December 1947), and in *Agricultural History*, 22: 64 (January 1948); Social Science Research Council, *The Use of Personal Documents in History, Anthropology, and Sociology*, prepared for the Committee on Appraisal of Research by Louis Gottschalk, Clyde Kluckhohn, and Robert Angell (*Bulletin* 53, New York, 1945), in *American Archivist*, 10: 189-190 (April 1947).

## 1948

"The Settlement of Grasslands," in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1948, p. 16-25.

"Their Road Led West: How Swedish Pioneers Became American Farmers," in *American Swedish Monthly*, 43(6): 63-65, 110-111, illus. (June 1948).

REVIEWS: Richard Bardolf, *Agricultural Literature and the Early Illinois Farmer* (Urbana, Ill., 1948), in *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 32: 201-203 (December 1948), and in *Agricultural History*, 23: 80 (January 1949); Edward Dumbauld, *Thomas Jefferson, American Tourist . . .* (Norman, Okla., 1946), in *ibid.*, 22: 63 (January 1948); G. E. Fussell, *The Old English Farming Books from Fitzherbert to Tull, 1523 to 1730* (London, 1947), in *ibid.*, 22: 63 (January 1948); J. C. Malin, *The Grassland of North America: Prolegomena to Its History* (Lawrence, Kans.), in *Journal of Economic History*, 8: 188-189 (November 1948), and in *Agricultural History*, 23: 79-80 (January 1949); Kenneth Ruble, *Men to Remember: How 100,000 Neighbors Made History* (Chicago, 1947), in *Minnesota History*, 29: 158-159 (June 1948); P. F. Sharp, *The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada: A Survey Showing American Parallels* (Minneapolis, 1948), in *ibid.*, 29: 341-342 (December 1948), and in *Agricultural History*, 23: 80 (January 1949).

## 1949

"Edmund Cody Burnett," *Agricultural History*, 23: 160 (April 1949).

"Europe's Contribution to the American Dairy Industry," *Journal of Economic History, Supplement*, 9(1949): 72-84.

This paper was presented under the title, "The Development of Modern Dairy Technique," at the meeting of the Economic History Association at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., on Sept. 10, 1949.

REVIEWS: E. T. Booth, *Country Life in America as Lived by Ten Presidents of the United States* (New York, 1947), in *Agricultural History*, 23: 79 (January 1949); D. B. Greenberg, *Countryman's Companion* (New York, 1947), in *ibid.*, 23: 79 (January 1949); N. M. Tilley, *The Bright Tobacco Industry, 1860-1929* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1948), in *North Carolina Historical Review*, 26: 349-351 (July 1949), and in *Agricultural History*, 24: 62-63 (January 1950).



## 1950

"Charles J. Brand," *Agricultural History*, 24: 62 (January 1950).

*Review*, 55: 693 (April 1950), and in *Agricultural History*, 24: 175-176 (July 1950).

## 1951

"Claribel R. Barnett," *Agricultural History*, 25: 143 (July 1951).

REVIEWS: W. G. Hoskins, ed., *Studies in Leicestershire Agrarian History* (Leicester, 1949), in *Agricultural History*, 25: 143-144 (July 1951); O. B. Jesness, W. P. Kirkwood, H. K. Hayes, W. H. Tomhave, F. W. Peck, W. C. Coffey, and A. H. Gilmore, *Andrew Boss, Agricultural Pioneer and Builder, 1867-1947* (St. Paul, 1950), in *Minnesota History*, 32: 118 (Summer 1951); and Nelson Klose, *America's Crop Heritage: The History of Foreign Plant Introduction by the Federal Government* (Ames, 1950), in *American Historical Review*, 56: 990-991 (July 1951).

## 1952

"Foreword," in Henry C. and Anne Dewees Taylor, *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932* (Ames, 1952), p. vii-ix.

REVIEW: Theodore Saloutos and J. D. Hicks, *Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939* (Madison, 1951) and R. B. Nye, *Midwestern Progressive Politics: A Historical Study of Its Origins and Development, 1870-1950* (Lansing, 1951), in *Agricultural Economics Research*, 4: 96-97 (July 1952).

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE EVERETT EUGENE EDWARDS MEMORIAL AWARDS

At the annual meeting of the Agricultural History Society, held in the Lafayette Hotel, at Lexington, Kentucky, on May 7, 1953, in accordance with recommendations made by the Edwards' Memorial Committee and subsequently approved by vote of the members present on that occasion, the Society in partial recognition of the outstanding services of Everett E. Edwards to the organization, and also in honor of his memory, established two Annual Awards, henceforth to be known as *The Everett Eugene Edwards Memorial Awards*. These honors are to be given to the authors of the two best articles (Presidential Addresses excluded) which are published in *Agricultural History* in each current year. One prize of \$50.00 is to be assigned to an author who is in course of taking a degree and one prize of \$50.00 to an author who is a more advanced scholar. An Edwards' Memorial Award Committee, the members of which will serve staggered terms of office, to be appointed shortly

by the President, Edward N. Wentworth, will administer the awards. The first Awards will be designated for articles appearing in *Agricultural History* in 1953 and they will be given annually thereafter.

The idea of such a Memorial to Everett Edwards was originally suggested to the Edwards Memorial Committee by Howard Hyman Goldin, Thomas J. Mayock, and Wayne D. Rasmussen, and these three members of the Agricultural History Society generously have guaranteed the amounts necessary to pay the Awards for a period of ten years, should this prove to be necessary. The guarantee of the three, who invite others interested to join them in the guarantee, has been accepted by the Memorial Committee as a safeguard for the Awards but the Society will draw first upon the Volunteer Memorial Fund which was assembled spontaneously and deposited with the Treasurer of the Society following the death of Everett Edwards on

May 1, 1952. It is contemplated that this Volunteer Fund, at present amounting to \$206, will be merged with an Edwards' Memorial Fund which will be set up by the Society and for which subscriptions will soon be invited.

Should the Edwards' Memorial Fund grow to a sufficient amount it would be possible for the Agricultural History Society at a later period to set up other Memorial Awards additional to those which have just been established. Among those which have been suggested, all of which are worthwhile and would stimulate interest in the Society, are

annual Awards for the Best Bibliography of Agricultural History; the Best Article on Agricultural History Published Anywhere; and the Best Book on Agricultural History. Other projects propose the setting up of Revolving Funds which would be used to aid students in Undertaking Research in Agricultural History, and to assist in publishing the Results of Agricultural History Research.

#### THE EVERETT EDWARDS MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

Herbert A. Kellar, Chairman

Lewis E. Atherton

Edward N. Wentworth

### NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

The notes making up this section were prepared for the journal by Everett E. Edwards shortly before his death. They, with a review published in the July 1952 issue of *Agricultural Economics Research*, represent his last contributions in the field of historical criticism.

#### AGRICULTURAL DISCONTENT IN THE MIDDLE WEST

Professor Hicks' book *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931) has remained the standard and definitive work on the subject for two decades. It was inevitable that Professor Hicks should continue his study of the subject of his book—the organizations and the movements of farmers in the twentieth century. It was just as inevitable that his history seminars during the middle 1930s at the University of Wisconsin should be devoted to the continuation of the study of the subject of the Populist revolt. The result is *Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939*, by Theodore Saloutos and John D. Hicks (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1951, 581 p., \$6.75).

The volume is a product of the meticulous research of two distinguished historians who have devoted two decades to the study of farmer organizations. It is an indispensable addition to the bibliography of the Middle Border. Future studies will add little in the way of new information on the subject.

*Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West* is the first broad historical treatment of agrarian unrest in the United States in the twentieth century. It is the story of how American agriculture formulated its objectives and used them so effectively during the last two decades. It is a realistic study, taking into account the farm legislation enacted in Washington, but focusing attention on the Nation's debt to the Middle West.

The chapters of this book are excellent summaries of the historical background and movements that the

twentieth century developed. Here the author tells the familiar story of the organized farmers from the era of Patrons of Husbandry. Equally important, these chapters submit the period to economic analysis. Clearly, the Middle Western farmers were indoctrinated in antimonopolism, in the physiocratic faith that agriculture was the basic industry in the economy, and in the belief that they had not been receiving a fair share of the national income. They were devoted, moreover, to the use of government power to protect their interests. Farmers were pictured as small capitalists, determined to protect their investments and anxious to have a fair return from their labor. This is perhaps correct from the viewpoint of economic analyses, but the authors should have made equally clear that farmers thought of themselves as producers. Capitalists were grain dealers in Minneapolis or the money lenders of Wall Street.

The authors view the parity program as "a form of economic appeasement to the farmer" which promised "no equivalent benefits to the millions of unorganized consumers, the countless white-collar workers, school teachers, pensioners, widows and others who lived on fixed incomes. . . . Nor did it promise to make possible a very effective use of our natural resources." Perhaps farmers achieved through political action what they had failed to get through hard work during the previous century.

The accuracy of this volume and the absence of mistakes insure that it will be the standard work on this subject for many years, just as *The Populist Revolt* has been for the last two decades.—Everett E. Edwards.

#### IOWA AGRICULTURE

Earle D. Ross' *Iowa Agriculture: An Historical Survey* (Iowa City, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1951, 226 p., \$4.50) complements the topical volume entitled

*A Century of Farming in Iowa, 1846-1946* (Ames, 1946) prepared by members of the Iowa State College faculty. The present volume is an integrated, chronological review of the same period. Here the distinctive epochs appear and recede. The era of initial settlement was succeeded by the awakening fifties with their fairs, agricultural journals, plows, and improvements in plants and animals; the Civil War produced the evanescent sheep and sorghum crazes; the postwar transition from wheat to a corn-hog economy was enduring.

Though "developments in research, instruction, and demonstration" increased production, they contributed to the legacy of overcapitalization and depression which in turn led to the political action of the 1920s and 1930s. Together, these forces meant that "Corn Belt farming had become fully commercialized by the fifth decade of the century."

In many respects this is a model state agricultural history. It is comprehensive—there is scarcely an aspect of the institutional and technical development of agriculture which is not mentioned. The Iowa developments are placed in their regional, national, and international settings. As stated in William J. Petersen's foreword, it is "an interpretive survey rather than a detailed and definitive study." It is the product of a lifetime of research in the field of American history rather than the result of a particular research project. It is more abstract than graphic, more institutional than human, and more for the historian than for the general reader.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

#### CATTLE RANCHING IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Robert G. Cleland's *The Cattle on a Thousand Hills; Southern California, 1850-1880* (ed. 2, San Marino, Huntington Library, 1951, 365 p., \$5.00) is a detailed presentation of Southern California society and economy during its first three American decades. The book presents a detailed analysis of the problems of transition from a Mexican cattle-raising frontier through an American cattle-raising frontier to an American community based upon a more diversified agriculture and commerce. Besides the cattle boom, the author discusses the Indian problem and how it was solved, crimes of violence, and the penchant of the California frontier for vigilante or lynch law. This edition has a new chapter covering the decline of sheep raising, the establishment of Pasadena, Riverside, Pomona, and San Fernando, the gains in orange and wheat raising, railroad building, and booster literature.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

#### GAIL BORDEN

Joe B. Frantz's *Gail Borden, Dairyman to a Nation* (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1951, 310 p., \$5.00) is a lengthy account of Gail Borden's chief claim to fame, the condensing of milk and its successful commercialization. The story here presented lacks correla-

tion with the history of the growth of dairy farming in the United States.

From his birthplace and early youth in New York, Borden moved through the Kentucky-Indiana-Ohio country to Mississippi where he taught school and surveyed. His wanderlust then led him to East Texas, where he remained thirty years. He became the head of Stephen F. Austin's land office, a newspaper publisher, and collector of the port of Galveston. In his later years, Borden was an associate of high government officials and a leading citizen of ante-bellum Texas.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

#### REGIONALISM

*Regionalism in America* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1951, 425 p., \$6.50), edited by Merrill Jensen and with a foreword by Felix Frankfurter, is made up of papers delivered at a symposium on American regionalism held at the University of Wisconsin, April 14 and 15, 1949. The symposium was sponsored by the Committee on the Study of American Civilization of the University of Wisconsin, a committee appointed to administer a grant of funds from the Rockefeller Foundation for use at the University.

The volume is divided into 5 parts with a total of 15 papers. Part 1 is concerned with the concept of regionalism. Fulmer Mood considers its origin, evolution, and application from 1750 to 1900; Vernon Carstensen its development and application from 1900 to 1950; and R. B. Vance its use as a tool for social research. Part 2 is concerned with some historic regions of the United States. It is made up of an introduction by W. B. Hesseltine and consideration of the South by F. B. Simkins, of the Spanish Southwest by J. W. Caughey, and of the Pacific Northwest by Lancaster Pollard. Part 3 is on regional aspects of American culture, with an introduction and papers on American literature, painting, architecture, and linguistics. Part 4 is devoted to the concept of regionalism as a practical force. The introduction is by J. M. Gaus, and there are chapters on the Tennessee Valley Authority by G. R. Clapp, on the Great Lakes Cutover Region by W. A. Rowlands, and on the Great Plains-Missouri Valley Region by Elmer Starch. Part 5 is on the limitations and promise of regionalism. Merle Curti contributes the introduction, Louis Wirth points out the limitations of regionalism, and H. W. Odum discusses the promise of regionalism.

There is an extensive bibliographic note in addition to bibliographic comments by authors of some of the chapters. The book is not indexed and there is no discussion of agricultural regionalism.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

#### WORK OF JAMES C. MALIN

The article by Thomas H. LeDuc, "An Ecological Interpretation of Grasslands History," that appeared in *Nebraska History*, 31: 226-233 (September 1950), is

an appraisal of four books by Professor James C. Malin of the University of Kansas and past president of our Society. The books are: *Winter Wheat in the Golden Belt of Kansas; A Study in Adaption to Subhumid Geographical Environment* (Lawrence, University of Kansas Press, 1944, 290 p., \$3.00); *Essays on Historiography* (Lawrence, The Author, 1946, 188 p., \$2.50); *The Grassland of North America; Prolegomena to Its History* (Lawrence, The Author, 1947, 398 p., \$3.00);

and *Grassland Historical Studies; Natural Resources Utilization in a Background of Science and Technology; Vol. 1, Geology and Geography* (Lawrence, The Author, 1950, 377 p., \$2.50). Of the author of these works, Dr. LeDuc says: "It is clear that he is not only an incisive critic of several basic hypotheses long and well regarded among historians, but also a creative worker of prodigious industry, immense learning, and disciplined imagination."—*Everett E. Edwards.*

be  
ag  
on  
top  
ra  
ag  
W  
rec  
eve  
dri  
last  
and  
ove  
pic  
dra  
rese  
radi  
H  
of a  
in  
sear  
Dan  
Ame  
oppo  
rich  
quai  
I wa  
not t  
movi  
well  
tincti  
activ  
food  
and c  
whole  
vance  
but t  
How  
I hav  
with l  
attitud  
\* Th  
addres  
Society



## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON CONSTRUCTIVE AGRICULTURAL MOVEMENTS

EDWARD N. WENTWORTH

*Armour's Livestock Bureau*

Perhaps the title of my address is a misnomer because I am presenting no formal analysis of agricultural problems, but am relying so heavily on my personal experience and contacts that my topic ought to be called "Some Recollections" rather than "Some Observations."\* Two years ago last June, I listened to a highly respected Westerner, Captain Dan D. Casement of Kansas, recount from his personal experiences numerous events which bridged the period covered by the driving of the Golden Spike, the excitement of the last Indian wars (especially the Meeker Massacre), and the closing of the Texas cattle trails in Kansas, over to the modern West—with its motorized pick-ups, its trailer-borne cow horses, its motor-drawn chuck and herders' wagons, its airplane reseeding and brush removal programs, and its radio and television sets.

His recollections stirred my memory about scores of agricultural movements with which I have been in touch—movements less spectacular to the searcher after adventure than those of Captain Dan, but integrally a vital part of the history of American agriculture. I deserve no credit for my opportunity to participate, but I cherish the richness of experience and the breadth of acquaintance I gained thereby. The men with whom I was associated were molded as individuals; it was not their custom to "say it with flowers", and the movies, radio, television, national advertising, as well as the host of other levelers of personal distinctiveness, had laid no baleful spell over their activities. The great men in agricultural education, food and fiber production, and in the associated and complementary industries, who struggled so whole-heartedly for human rather than class advancement, not only claimed my deepest respect, but taught me much about tolerance.

However, that tolerance was not boundless. I have never been able to conquer my impatience with leftist thinking in agriculture. Such a personal attitude would never do in the production of

historical writing and analysis but, since I am reporting on my own contacts with constructive agricultural movements, you may forgive the fact that I report only things which possibly, to you, seem rightist. Perhaps therewith I make a *great* discovery. Back in my school days children always had more trouble with subtraction and division than with addition and multiplication. Since the leftists have so loved politically to divide and subtract, this should prove that they are much smarter than the rightists, as the goal of the latter has always seemed to be to add and to multiply. Subtraction and division may be necessary for social justice, though I have never found it so, but it is the adders and multipliers who feed and supply the nearly seven thousand new youngsters that arrive in this country daily, and who build up the reserves on which the world's well-being is based.

When I was first introduced to the higher agricultural motivations in 1900, I thrilled to the blessedness of the man who made two blades of grass grow where one grew before. In that year I was appointed a clerk in the cattle department at the Iowa State Fair, and for the first time became acquainted with beef cattle. Previously my father had exposed me to registered Holstein-Friesian dairy cows, bred by a Scandinavian farmer named Jens Clausen of Story County, Iowa. Clausen was not only enough of a breeder to set numerous records in the early days of cow testing, but he also possessed a sufficiently potent heredity to beget today's head of the Genetics Department at the University of California in Berkeley.

I then knew nothing of breeding for meat production, but I have never forgotten Dean Charles F. Curtiss's quotation from the address given by the Duke of Bedford at the Annual Dinner of the Smithfield Club in 1800. The Duke not only crystallized the aims and ideals of the Club, but furthermore expressed his instinctive appreciation of the principles on which American agriculture became successful and on which the industries that supplemented it have brought higher gross returns to the farmer than in any other nation—namely

\*This paper was presented as the presidential address at a meeting of the Agricultural History Society in Washington on December 28, 1952.

through great volume and close margins of profit. The Duke said: "There are two things which we should most solicitously avoid: first, most certainly not to associate to raise prices... secondly, we ought to pursue no measure which would have even the appearance of raising prices. The only true object of the farmer is to profit, not by high prices, but by *great products*. The increase of quantity, not price, should ever be his aim."

Then to further the idea of public service, rather than to penalize the consumer as many agricultural demagogues have attempted to do ever since the farmer's vote became a political football, he continued: "It will be of essential service to prove what breeds of cattle there are which give the most food for man, from given quantities of food for animals. This is an object worthy of any society; and this object, I trust, will be effected by the unremitted zeal, enlightened views, and active exertions of this Society."

Most important in the Society's scheme of progress was the provision of incentive. Competition was set up in several fields, as for example, cattle finished on grass, hay, turnips and cabbages, or cattle finished under the best methods available, topped by corn or oilcake. A similar classification was set up for sheep under the same provisions. Soon it was recognized that more was involved than feeding, so a differentiation was made between breeds, and still later competition was established in carcasses and in joints of meat. Livestock shows over the rest of the world gradually came to be patterned on this style of award. The important thing is that progress was based on the competitive instinct, and men were permitted to reap a personal reward from their own efforts which promoted the public good. Over the years they had to be one hundred percent honest, since they could deal only with the natural processes of heredity, physiology, and nutrition, and cheaters were soon discovered. Thus developed, in an organized way, the first great step in making cheaper and better meat for the consumer. The *unselfish* work of serving one's neighbor ministered to one's own *selfish* advancement.

My appointment to the State Fair in Des Moines came when the westward tide of purebred livestock production was engulfing Iowa, especially in beef cattle, and the great feeders of the day, Governor S. B. Packard, D. M. Moninger, the Adams family of Odebolt, and others were proving the worth of the highly bred bullock in the

feedlot. Profitable production of top quality beef at the lowest cost had a moving frontier of its own. It did not follow the Frederick Jackson Turner hypothesis, in the sense of providing for the pioneer of spirit an escape-route from the rigidities of a settled civilization, or the restrictions of an industrialization in which costs and margins of profit had been established by weight of competition and custom. It did, however, provide an opportunity for cattle, swine, and mutton sheep of greater efficiency in meat production, to reach the bulging corn fields of a secondary frontier, well before the railroads could provide the low cost service that ultimately moved corn through all of the eastern farming areas.

I well remember how Governor Packard emphasized the great opportunities which Ohio and Kentucky had in beef production in the 1830's, when the Renicks were bringing in top Shorthorns from England, and when the cost of crossing the Appalachian barrier prohibited the eastward movement of grain. Up to the mid-1830's Ohio had a monopoly on this low cost prime beef, and then for fifteen years Indiana led the way. By the mid-1850's Illinois claimed the distinction, though Iowa began to take over in the late 1880's. This was in the eastern part of the state, and it is interesting that its progress westward did not depend so much on the costs of cattle and corn, as on the railway rate differentials, which seem unimportant now but which were all too effective then.

How perfectly I recall Governor Packard's solicitude for the Hereford, and his worry as to what those Scotch Shorthorns would do, when they could be bred in Iowa. He feared that they would perhaps make cheaper beef than the Herefords shipped in from the range. The Herefords he was buying in Omaha and Kansas City carried a sizeable freight charge in their original purchase cost. How much the thinking of agricultural leaders of that day depended on individual efforts like Governor Packard's and the competitive reduction of costs! How little it recked of crop and production limitation and concerted price manipulations!

By 1910 the low cost, quality beef frontier had reached Northwestern Missouri and Southeastern Iowa. Thomas Cross, a veteran cattle buyer of 65 years' experience, ranging from Detroit and Cleveland into the far West and Southwest, with whom I had business associations for more than a quarter-century, sensed the same economic urge

of-corn calling for top grade cattle. He related to me in considerable detail the transfer of this demand from Creston, Shenandoah, and the Sioux City area in Iowa, over to the west side of the Missouri and into the southeast section of South Dakota. Tom was a valuable contributor to the knowledge of this shift, for it was indelibly stamped in his mind, through an uncanny memory for individual trading transactions—for prices, weights, and qualities of animals, and for individual bids and asking prices. These transactions seemed to remain as clear years afterwards as though he had made his purchases just ten minutes before. Annual changes in price levels never bothered him. The figures were fixed in his head and he knew dollar and cent prices as instinctively as the perfect pitch musician knows tones when he hears them.

When the hundredth meridian was reached the call of cheap corn to choice cattle died, and today the cattlemen wrestles with lower costing substitute feeds that perpetuate the ideal so clairvoyantly enunciated by the Duke of Bedford.

I think that my youthful enthusiasm was stirred most by the faith which the livestock breeders exhibited in the purebred as a means of advancement. There was a real reverence for cattle whose blood could create so much in agricultural wealth, as well as for the so-called "master breeders" who could initiate the evolutionary steps that carried beef-making forward. I was a boyhood reader of Alvin Sanders' famous *Breeders' Gazette*, and followed its columns and sage expressions for sixteen years without dreaming that one day I would become a member of its respected staff. So when I saw at the Iowa Fair such characters as the famous Colonel T. S. Moberley, J. H. Pickrell, "Sim" Lockridge, and Colonel W. A. Harris of Shorthorn fame, or Thomas Clark, William S. VanNatta, T. F. B. Sotham, Charles Gudgell, and "Kirk" Armour from the Herefords, I felt as familiar with their backgrounds and constructive efforts as if I were seeing in a dream or vision the patriarchs of Genesis. Somehow that belief in the efficacy of the purebred, individually and step by step, set up an ambition for achievement in me that in those youthful days literally ran "gooseflesh up my back."

I cannot leave the purebreds without a moment's attention to the hog problem. There were fewer constructive minds in the hog business. Swine always have done such a good job of taking

care of their masters that they support hundreds of thousands of careless inefficient hog raisers just to get the benefit of a few thousand competent ones. But there were a few deeper thinkers who reversed the situation and tried to look out for the hog. After World War I we had a problem of too many fat cuts and too much lard, the surplus of which had previously gone to Europe when exchange values permitted. We have always had some who would swing from one end of the pendulum to the other, and they profited by the reaction against the extremely "chuffy type." The very lardy, over-fat "cob rollers" were processed as barrelled and mess pork, which with the heavy dry salt cuts provided active commodities on the provision market in the days before 1900. Thereafter, such overfat meats became increasingly undesirable. Refrigeration began to spread slowly into the retail butcher shops of the hinterland, and the rising proportion of city dwellers, who did proportionately less muscular work, destroyed the demand for most prime meats of the 19th century type. The production of the final finish in an animal was the most expensive item in feeding and by 1905 various hog breeders were experimenting with the so-called "big type." These were hogs of massive frame that made their chief gains through growth. But their meat fiber was so coarse, their bones so heavy, and their cuts so badly shaped that they pleased the consumer no more than the fatty cuts from the small type hogs that had preceded them.

The recession in hog prices at the close of World War I stimulated a lot of interest in the type of hog that should be marketed. At the various swine shows, and especially the International Livestock Exposition, barrows weighing from 375 pounds to 500 pounds were being made grand champions, despite the fact that the consumer preferred cuts from 200 to 250 pound animals. Hence a group of swine men and packers met together to discuss standards for a so-called "meat type" hog. I was one of those included in the early conferences, and was able to help phrase the definitions. But definitions of type alone were too abstract, and in 1927 at the National Swine Show in Peoria, a barrow show was held in which the ideals worked up by the conference were placed in operation. Few realized how effective this move was going to prove in bringing together more closely the ideals of breeders, finishers, and processors of market hogs. During the next twelve years the barrow

show was moved from place to place throughout the country with significant educational effect until World War II terminated the exhibition.

In the summer of 1945 leaders of the industry decided that such a barrow show should be resumed. It was set up as a separate entity in Austin, Minnesota, where it was possible to develop the educational features to the highest degree. The two guiding spirits in developing the ideals of the show were R. L. Pemberton of Iowa and the late W. T. Reneker of Chicago. With them were a host of breeders, packer representatives, college men, and government officials. Hormel & Company and the city fathers of Austin were especially to be commended. Many of the refinements of the meat phase of the shows were perfected by Fred Beard of the United States Department of Agriculture, aided by the various meat specialists and extension swine husbandmen of the agricultural colleges. In the new meat-type hog, which the show has developed, have been combined the lean and fat standards of the British bacon hog along with the proportions of wholesale cuts on which the American pork industry is based.

The spirit of competition was still appealed to. On the other side of the argument were many so-called practical economists who urged the use of the Danish system of classification under which first prize and champion ribbons were not awarded, but animals were sorted out that would fall into the various grades. To most men accustomed to animal breeding this seemed to lead to stagnation rather than progress. Groups or classes never beget a higher level of merit—only individuals. Perhaps the averages of the commercial pork produced in the country might be improved through mass standards, but no incentive is provided for the breeder to take the next step forward. Progress depends on the man who constantly improves livestock that can move way out in front, rather than on a mere recognition and classification of the kind of animals we have on hand. This last is the work of the divider, never of the adder and multiplier.

From my own experiences I could tell of equal stimuli from the sheep competitions, the lessons of the carlot contests among all classes of animals, and the tremendous strides made by the pedigree stock breeders in adapting their animals to the consumers' requirements, but time is short. So I turn to another phase of animal industry, with which I next came in contact, the profession of

animal husbandry. For two years before I went to college, it was my good fortune to know Professor John A. Craig, alliteratively called the "Stockman's Schoolmaster," who organized livestock appraisal into a college course, and who published, with score cards and illustrations, the first book on judging livestock. Perhaps I have a selfish angle in my appreciation of him, for he offered me a position with him in Oklahoma.

Craig's body was semi-crippled from childhood, but his soul led his fellowmen and their livestock servants to new goals of achievement. That he was super-constructive goes without saying. Just before his death he wrote: "Lord . . . give me an ideal that will stand the strain of weaving into human stuff on the loom of the real. Keep me from caring for books more than for folks, for art more than for life. Steady me to do my full stint of work as well as I can, and when that is done, stop me, pay me what wages Thou wilt, and help me to say from a quiet heart, a grateful Amen."

What a shock that would deal to the majority of citizens today, who watch the clock, limit the output of their labor, and draw government relief checks while striking to impose even greater handicaps on the public in general, and the management which employs them in particular. The leftist would scorn Professor Craig as a "bleeding heart," but it was my experience that, no matter how deeply their emotions were covered, the great leaders of the young science and art of agriculture (Henry, Davenport, Curtiss, Bailey, Waters, just to mention a few) carried forward only under the ideals Craig enunciated.

When I was graduated from college in 1907, the demand for men trained in animal husbandry seemed insatiable. So with others I became an animal husbandry professor. The reaction of practical farmers to our craft was amazing. Just a few years earlier, according to tradition, farmers were protesting that they would never send their sons to farm schools, especially to learn to milk a cow. Any newborn calf could do the job better without any lessons at all. But I found other farmers who were amazed at what "book-learning" could contribute to a relatively ignorant student. My roommate, the late Tom Moody of Indiana, and I were sent to judge a fair in western Iowa; he to pass on the swine and horses while I was working on the cattle and sheep. Tom had struggled over an intensely tight placing between two junior yearling Poland-China boars. When questioned as to his



reasons for putting his first choice up, he stated that it had much more constitution, and especially a bigger heart-girth. Possibly I was ribbed, but three farmers came to me just after lunch and said: "It's wonderful what you young fellows learn in college. We measured those Poland boars during the noon hour and, by gracious, the first hog was nearly a half-inch bigger around the chest than the second. How do you college fellows learn to recognize that so quickly?" Since there was no "belittlin'" in their tone of voice, I told Tom what they had said. "Good heavens," he replied, "I thought there was more than a two-inch difference!"

A few years later the scientific approach to judging temporarily laid us low. It announced, on the basis of the earlier genetic research covering *qualitative* characters, and the differences between genotypes and phenotypes, that no human being could look at a bull or a cow and tell how either was going to breed. My budding learning as a geneticist made me agree, for I firmly believed that no one could recognize from the appearance of an animal whether it was homozygous or heterozygous in its most desirable characters. But neither I, nor any other geneticist, had acquired that practiced eye of the breeder, which seemed to be able to tell by inspection the degree of *quantitative* inheritance that would be transmitted through the majority of the germ cells. Perhaps it lay in that mysterious realm that the breeder called prepotency, which he estimated by the traits lumped as "masculinity" or "femininity," but which we tried to laugh off as the mere expression of secondary sexual characters. But somehow in meat animals he made great progress, which we could explain in part only, until we learned by research how high a degree of heritability existed in most characters of meat conformation—more than showed up phenotypically for any other kind of characteristics. Of course we have found—(or have we?)—that the old idea of relating "form to function," i.e., appearance to physiological activity, is completely unsound. We have always admitted that breeding was more of an art than a science, but only in the last decade have we begun to surmise how basically scientific that art is.

This reminds me of a second incident dealing with the bigness of certain of those old-time agricultural leaders. At the close of my first freshman term at Iowa State College, just after Christmas Day, 1903, Professor P. G. Holden, the

seed corn crusader, assigned me to teach corn judging at the farmers' short course. At my table there were about ten men, all mature, and for three or four days I worked with them, anxiously trying to demonstrate what I had learned. My age was still sixteen, but fortunately I told them at the start that all I knew in this field was what Professor Holden had taught me. One afternoon my father came through the College, and saw that I had a table composed of the ten leading commercial seed-grain producers of the state. He promptly sought Professor Holden, and laid him out for ruining my budding career in agricultural education by placing me under such a handicap. Holden told him in reply, "Keep your shirt on, and don't go near the table or your boy until after the class is over. Then invite any of them you wish to have dinner with you." My father responded and took the whole table, plus myself. Soon he introduced the subject of their tolerance in accepting a mere child to teach them. One rugged old German from Shenandoah, Iowa, responded in broken English "We gif not a damn if he is a kid, he learnt sumtings, didn't he?" I was very grateful for that support.

As a result of that incident I taught Farmers' Institutes for four years and short courses for nine. This work did far more for me than it ever could have done for those who endured my efforts. It gave me a chance to become associated with another pioneer in the educational field, who was a real old-fashioned livestock expert, John Gosling. "Uncle John" was an Englishman, a devout member of the Church of England, who was brought up as a fattener of cattle and sheep, and who learned the butcher trade over there. In the early 1880's he came to this country with the great Swan Land & Cattle Company of Cheyenne. When the sale of range cattle went into a temporary slump ahead of the hard winter of 1886-7, he took charge of Alex Swan's farm at Indianola, Iowa, and fattened the unsalable end of the range runs there. His success made him a figure in the commercial cattle world, while his uncanny insight into what was under the hide or pelt brought him to Iowa State College for the first Farmers' Short Course in Agriculture.

"Uncle John" used to take two steers of different grade and weight, two cows of contrasting beef quality, two hogs, and two or three sheep; then give a lecture on what he expected to find in the carcass, hide or pelt, and the tallow or excess lard

in each. He would have sheets issued, listing all of the cuts of meat, and then would give his estimate of the percentage of dressed to live weights, the percentage of each of the wholesale cuts in each animal and species, ask each farmer in attendance to record his own estimates as well as "Uncle John's," and then all would await the results. Gosling's accuracy was amazing. Practically never did he miss a single estimate by more than a quarter of one percent. From his demonstrations came carcass classes on foot at most of the big shows, and eventually the courses in meats in the colleges. Credit for the latter usually goes to Professor Andrew Boss of the University of Minnesota, but "Uncle John" Gosling was the man who instigated the popular demand at a time when the subject was not deemed sufficiently dignified for collegiate attention.

Stock judging, plus this work, helped agriculture approach more and more closely to what the consumer required in meat. Within the two techniques was incorporated the "know-how" essential to the successful stockman. I was proud when I became a member of a winning stock-judging team at the International Livestock Exposition. I was even happier when I found that it provided me with a language through which I could talk to breeders all over the livestock world.

In the spring of 1919 I spent six hours at the National Rambouillet Sheep Breeding Farm, some forty miles east of Paris. The only English words the head shepherd knew were "ram" and "ewe," which were difficult to work into a protracted conversation. I merely read and translated French without speaking the language. Yet together we inspected records dating back to Louis XVI, studied wool fibers and grades, and he sheared a sheep for me in the French manner while I reciprocated in the American style. We separated thoroughly convinced of each other's craftsmanship, and corresponded for years—he writing me in French and I replying in English, both translating the letters on receipt. We remained good friends until his death.

Had we been leftists we would have argued with warm emotion over the method of grading fleeces more artificially in order to serve the down-trodden. But we both worshipped at the altar of livestock improvement, and when we meet in the hereafter I know our first discussion will not cover social service, but *better sheep*—better to serve all humanity.

I mentioned the great demand for animal husbandmen from 1905 to 1908. By 1912 we were looking just as avidly for men to serve as county agricultural agents, by 1920 for county Boys' and Girls' Club Leaders, by 1922 for agricultural economists, and through rhythmic periods from 1905 forward for agricultural journalists. All of these, except the economists, held steadfast to that ever unattainable goal of perfection.

I was soon interested in the youth programs, for my father was a close friend of two of its pioneers, and often entertained them in our home. One was the great Seaman Knapp, who originated the Boys' and Girls' Club work in the South during the 1890's. The other was William Beardshear, president of Iowa State College, who before 1900 read an essay on the three H's—head, hand, and heart—that led to the accepted nomenclature of the 4-H Clubs. I had three opportunities to assist in the early development of this work. In 1909 I helped O. H. Benson, public school superintendent for Wright County, Iowa, by managing his first judging contest for rural youth at one of the country schools. It was an inspiration to find young farm boys who knew so much of the constructive principles and ideals of livestock production. Second, at the Iowa State Fair under the direction of W. J. Kennedy, professor of animal husbandry, I supervised the first livestock judging contest for farm boys trying to win scholarships at Iowa State College. Then, just after the first World War, I managed a contest at Atlanta between Club teams representing various livestock states, the winner to go to England for competition against British youngsters. Based on visits in 1919, I advised the three winners what breeders they should call on if they had opportunity while in Britain. From the refining flame of these events, and the proving of his mettle as manager of the Silver Lake herd of Herefords at Forth Worth, came one of our outstanding present-day agricultural leaders, Jack Turner, secretary of the American Hereford Breeders Association.

One more brief experience before I close; I mentioned work on the staff of the *Breeders' Gazette*. Even when I was with the paper in 1914 we could begin to feel the encroaching restrictions of a federal bureaucracy. In the first century of agricultural journalism the editor of a farm paper had a tremendous influence on his clientele. His advice on all sorts of subjects was sought and his authority accepted. This was true

all over the country, but in the middle west I felt the particular influence of James H. and Alvin H. Sanders, of "Uncle Henry" Wallace, of "Jim" Pierce, and somewhat earlier of Norman J. Colman. Such editors were examples of a "rugged individualism" that had already become anathema in federal circles, even before the day of the New Deal. The vast number of federal bulletins, federal publicity writers, and popular bulletins from the state experiment stations, gradually sapped the authoritative position of the earlier type of farm editor, and the development of breed papers among the various cattle and swine organizations took most of the advertising from the more generalized livestock journals. So the farm publications took over more of the news and reportorial side of the agricultural field, or went out of business. An analysis of this change from an editorial attitude to a reportorial type is very apparent if one studies the format of a magazine like the *Country Gentleman* or the *Farm Journal* by ten year periods for the last half century or so. The development of the entertainment features during this period has been most striking, and the replacement of the editorial "we" by the reportorial "he" marks a definite change in the relationship of the voice of the farm paper to those on its circulation lists. Thus has another admired form of individualism in agriculture vanished, in the mad mass of welfare and support movements sponsored by the socialized minded and adopted by those who seek a security that lacks the principal advantages of freedom.

But some vestiges of the old independence still remain. The stockmen still want protection against disease and competition from nations with low standards of living, but they want it as an umbrella to shield everybody rather than in the form of personal handouts. They still would like to see, under its aegis, the spirit of competition prevail within our borders. At the meeting of the California Cattlemen's Association in San Diego just two weeks ago, the president of the American National Cattle Association, Sam Hyatt, read a letter from an old-time cowboy and rancher who came to Wyoming in 1895. As a boy of fifteen years he rode the range for thirty dollars a month. I submit the following extracts to remind you that the race of he-men in agriculture is still not extinct.

"Even as old as I am, if I knew of a place like Wyoming was fifty years ago, that is where I would be headed

for. This centralized government meddling is getting me down. In those days our government was to help, protect, and defend us, not to restrict, befuddle, and harass us, and we did not look to the government for a livelihood of handouts and special privileges secured for us by unscrupulous politicians in return for our votes. Also the hundred-cent honest dollar you made, you could pocket or spend without keeping books and records, and you could conduct your legitimate business without government interference."

Sam Hyatt commented that no one wanted to go back to the old horse and buggy days and eliminate our fifty years of technical progress, but we would certainly like to go back to the time of less government in business and more business in government.

Contrast this viewpoint with a quotation from a New Zealand official's statement, where socialized control is rampant and the government agent smugly pats himself on the back for his liberality. "Real incentive to produce more pig meats has been given through the Ministry's allowable increase in price, which has been operative since August 4, 1952. This increase, amounting to a total of 3d. per pound, is the largest ever permitted at one step. The price now paid to farmers represents the full realization under the United Kingdom contract." This provides a gripe for the independent farmer. He wants this opportunity transmitted to him under the free operation of the law of supply and demand, not as a concession from an official, whose government up to that moment is denying him opportunity to profit, and which acts so belatedly from a production standpoint, and so precipitously according to the seasonal rhythm of natural processes, that the farmer can never take advantage of his business opportunity.

A century ago all farmers fought vigorously for the opportunity to advance, because under the principle of individual liberty each could do his best and retain the fruits of his labors. Everybody of experience believed that the nation could not be strong unless it provided the incentives needed to make its people do their best. As the proportion of urbanites in the population has increased, and relatively fewer people are exposed to the climatic and seasonal forces of Nature, the tendency grows to extend the protection from natural extremes which the cities afford, to protection from economic extremes. And therewith individual incentive dies.

We have seen its haplessness in the meat

situation this summer and fall, when OPS withheld the price response on the meats in greatest demand, so that the grower and feeder could not profit, and the markets piled up with lower grade meats which the public would not buy. This demand for regulation and security is rapidly casting our entire American life into a pattern of sameness, where individual worth is discouraged and unrewarded, and someone on top tells us that he knows better than we what is good for us. If this does not lead to the "dictatorship of the prole-

tariat," it at least leads to the dictatorship of the mediocre, and that great glad challenge to progress felt by our farmers of a half century to a century and a half ago, has died. Perhaps it is evolution at work in America, but to me it is devolution. In my boyhood I remember dozens of enthusiastic tireless youngsters in the cities where I find only one today. If the consumer, who makes the agricultural market, has lost his joy in living, how much of the urban burden will the farm youth of tomorrow be able to assume?

## LAND TENURE AND LAND REFORM IN MODERN RUSSIA

LAZAR VOLIN

*Foreign Agricultural Service  
United States Department of Agriculture*

Few countries have had such varied experience with the problem of land tenure and land reform as Russia during the past hundred years.<sup>1</sup> Within this period Russian peasantry, i.e., the great mass of the Russian population, has passed through the whole gamut of changes in the agrarian structure: serfdom, liberation and agrarian reforms, revolutions, counter-revolutions and, at last, but let us hope not finally, a sort of a new enslavement to the State in the kolkhoz, the collective farm. The one central thread in this history that is never completely lost is the contest of the peasant with the land-owning nobility and its protector, the Tsarist government. This contest gave way, after 1917, to a struggle between the peasant and the Communist state. In the course of the peasant-landlord contest, the Government was confronted, on several occasions, with a dilemma—agrarian reform or revolution—which was resolved now one way, now the other.

Nearly a hundred years ago, while serfdom still prevailed in Russia, Tsar Alexander II recognized this dilemma. He warned the serf-owning landlords that it would be better to liberate the serfs from above than to wait until they liberated themselves. It was a timely warning. For discontent was growing among the Russian peasantry, as was opposition to serfdom among the intelli-

gentsia, nurtured, as it was, on Western liberal and humanitarian ideas. The disastrous defeat in the Crimean War (1854-55) of the reactionary regime of Tsar Nicholas I, father of Alexander II, had already revealed the bankruptcy of the whole social system rooted in serfdom. Alexander read the handwriting on the wall and, despite opposition of the great majority of the influential serf-owning landlord class, chose the path of reform. The result was the famous Emancipation Manifesto of 1861, abolishing serfdom in Russia forever and opening a new era justly known as that of the Great Reforms.

However, the Russian peasant question was not solved by the Emancipation, as it was largely settled in Western Europe by the Great French Revolution and the subsequent agrarian reforms. Already, in the 1870's, the depressed condition of the liberated peasantry began to cause public and even official concern. This concern mounted as time went on, reaching a state of virtual alarm at the turn of the century. The peasant question, as the voluminous literature devoted to it attests, had truly become a burning national issue, especially after the peasantry shifted from passive suffering and discontent to rebellion in 1905, which foreshadowed the agrarian revolution of 1917.

Thus, forty years after Alexander II's far-reaching and promising agrarian reform, the country was faced with a severe agrarian crisis. Now, what were the causes of the crisis? What lessons can we learn from this experience that

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association, in Washington, D. C., December 28, 1952.



would be useful today, when international attention is focused on the problem of land reform in the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa—a problem that has become crucial in the contest between democracy and the survivals of feudalism, on the one hand, and Soviet Communism in propaganda and action, on the other?

The emancipation reform of the 1860's was based on sound principles: 1) The liberated peasants were to become small land proprietors. They were to be allotted holdings from land owned by their masters that would enable them to gain a livelihood and to pay taxes and the purchase price of the land. Thus, a landless proletariat, a tenant peasantry, was to be avoided. 2) The Government was to pay the landlords a fair price for the land allotted to the liberated peasants and collect it from the latter, over a long-term period in installments, so-called redemption payments. 3) Landlords were to receive no payment for liberating the person of the serf.

However, under the pressure of the land-owning class, which was influential at the imperial court and in the higher ranks of bureaucracy, the Emancipation Legislation and its implementation had deviated more or less widely from these basic principles. And from these deviations stemmed most of the difficulties that bedeviled the post-emancipation period of Russian agrarian history. This is a theme which I have only time to sketch briefly, omitting for the most part statistical and other details.

To begin with, a large group of the peasants were deprived of some of the land that they had tilled under serfdom. Many of them had more time once they were free from compulsory work on their former masters' estates, but less land of their own to cultivate. Such was the situation, particularly in the fertile black-soil region of European Russia where land was valuable to the landlords. In a large part of this region the area allotted to the liberated peasants was reduced by more than one-fourth, compared to their holdings under serfdom. In some provinces 40 percent and more of such land was kept by the landlords on emancipation.<sup>2</sup>

However, where the interests of the land-owning nobles were not involved, as in the case of peasants owned by the imperial family, and particularly the so-called state owned peasants, the terms of land

allotment were more generous. Likewise, in the western provinces the peasants fared better during the Emancipation, for here most of the landowners were Poles who became *personae non gratae* as a result of the Polish insurrection of 1863. Nevertheless, the central fact cannot be denied, that a large segment of the Russian peasantry gained its freedom with a niggardly endowment of land. The adverse effect of this loss of land on peasants' well-being became increasingly manifest with the rapid growth of population following Emancipation.

But in the beginning other shortcomings were more important than the smallness of the allotments. Landlords frequently retained the better land so the peasants were given land of inferior quality. Holdings were often also inconveniently situated. In some cases they were a long distance from the village; in others the peasant holding was accessible only by passage through the property of the landlord, which created a source of endless friction to plague the future peasant-landlord relations. The peasant holding frequently also lacked various essential elements of a well-balanced farm, such as pasture, forest, and water supply. Shortage of pasture affected adversely livestock, and, therefore, the supply of manure needed to fertilize the fields. Lack of forests meant that the inadequate forage supply of the peasant farm was diminished further by diversion of straw for fuel. To avoid such consequences, the peasants had to lease land from their former masters, often on onerous terms, again becoming economically dependent on the landlords.

Here, then, is the first object lesson of Russian agrarian reform: not only the size of the holding, but also the quality of the land and the location and balanced character of the holding, are important if the peasant is to be really an independent proprietor and if economic dependence on the large landowner is to be avoided.

In financial arrangements, as in the matter of land allotment, there was also a wide gap between the principles and the reality of emancipation settlement. The peasants were saddled with heavy redemption payments, which, in many cases, concealed illegal compensation for personal liberation. These payments often exceeded the market value of the allotted land at the time of the Emancipation. Furthermore, to the redemption payments were added high taxes and labor duties that earned the peasantry the invidious distinction of being the most heavily tax burdened class of prerevolu-

<sup>2</sup> P. I. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution*, translated by L. M. Herman, introduction by Calvin B. Hoover (New York, 1949), 382-84.

tionary Russia. And in order to make the peasants bear this heavy load and to insure the collection of redemption payments and taxes by the state, serious restrictions were placed on the peasants' civil and property rights.

The liberated Russian peasant, therefore, was not a full-fledged citizen or a fully independent land proprietor. The mir, or village community, which usually included peasant families who had been owned at the time of serfdom by the same master, was entrusted with the collective responsibility for the assessment and payment of the peasants' obligations to the state. This involved the burdensome practice of joint unlimited liability of all members of the mir for the tax obligations of each. For this purpose the mir was provided with wide police powers and discretionary authority over the peasant's life and property, which resulted in much abuse and oppression of the individual. The peasant could not legally sell his allotted land, nor could he refuse to accept it. He could not leave the village even temporarily without the consent of the mir, which could refuse to issue or renew that *sine qua non*, the passport. Thus, in many respects, the peasant exchanged one master, the landlord, for another one, the mir. It may be added that, while a thorough and enlightened judiciary reform was enacted in Russia in the 1860's, which resulted in peasants serving on juries in higher courts, these peasants, nevertheless, were subject to the jurisdiction of their own separate lower courts. These courts used so-called customary uncoded law that resulted in much arbitrariness, and they retained corporal punishment which had been abolished as a penalty in the general courts.

With some exceptions, the ownership of allotted land was vested in the mir and not in the individual peasant or peasant family. Under this system each peasant family was allotted, on some uniform basis, a holding (consisting usually of a number of non-contiguous scattered strips or plots), which it cultivated independently, unlike the present Soviet collective farming. Over a large part of Russia the mir system involved periodic or occasional repartition of land holdings in order to adjust them to changes in the membership of the mir. Such land repartition, or redistribution, was also often stimulated during the post-emancipation period by the need to readjust the fiscal burden among the different peasant families. The result was further fragmentation of the non-contiguous

peasant holdings and instability of tenure, which were inimical to agricultural progress.

The second lesson of Russian experience with agrarian reform plainly emerges: Mere allotment of land to small holders is a dubious economic procedure if the land is overpriced and over-taxed. Particularly is this true when rapid growth of rural population, as in 19th century Russia, leads to further diminution and fragmentation of holdings—a process which was encouraged by the repartitional and fiscal systems. A distinguished Russian statistician, Professor Kaufman, estimated that, at the end of the 19th century, the peasant holdings in a number of regions of European Russia had, on the average, a little over a half, or a half, and, in other regions less than a half, of the land that had been allotted to them during the Emancipation.<sup>3</sup> And it became customary to speak of over-population in the Central Black Soil Area of European Russia; though scholars usually qualified the concept by the term "relative" over-population, i.e. relative to the prevailing state of farm technique.

Rural overpopulation—"too many people on too little land"—is only too well-known in many of the underdeveloped countries. But it seems a paradox in the case of Russia, where, during the second half of the 19th century, there was still considerable free land for agricultural settlement; though the total area of land suitable for cultivation then, as now, should not be exaggerated as it is much less than one may assume by looking at the enormous territory of the country on the map.

However, migration of rural population to sparsely settled areas was discouraged by the Government during the first two post-emancipation decades for fear of depriving landowners of a cheap labor supply. The poverty of the Russian peasant and his inability to dispose legally of his allotted land also hindered migration. To be sure, all this did not prevent peasant farmers from infiltrating new regions. You will no doubt recall that the great Russian historian, Kluchevsky, stressed continuous colonization as "the basic fact" in Russian history. Still, large systematic migration, requiring considerable capital investment, did not begin until the end of the 19th century, especially after the construction of the Siberian Railroad. Then the Government changed

<sup>3</sup> A. A. Kaufman, *Agrarnyi Vopros v Rossii* [The Agrarian Question in Russia] (2nd ed., Moscow, 1918). 44-45.

its policy and began to assist and encourage resettlement on a large scale.

It is true that, in many cases, there was another way for the Russian peasant to overcome the shortage of land: namely, a transition to a more intensive, more productive farming, with higher returns per acre and per man. It was the path followed by small farmers in Western Europe. But agricultural intensification on a western pattern usually requires some capital, a knowledge of improved agricultural methods, personal initiative, and security of land tenure. And, of course, it is greatly helped by industrialization, which expands the markets for the products of intensive agriculture and provides a new occupational outlet for any surplus rural population. But practically all of these factors were lacking or weakly developed in Russia during the second half of the 19th century. Industrial revolution began in earnest in Russia only towards the close of the 19th century. Personal initiative was stifled by the atmosphere of regimentation and administrative oppression. I have already alluded to the insecurity of the repartitional tenure. And where would the Russian peasants, crushed as they were by the heavy burden of redemption payments and taxes, obtain capital needed to improve their farming, when, moreover, practically the only source of credit was the village usurer—the original “kulak” or fist? And how were the largely illiterate peasants to obtain knowledge of improved agricultural methods, without organized technical assistance and education? The failure of the Tsarist government, during the second half of the 19th century, to foster education was notorious. It failed not only to spread technical agronomic knowledge, but even to stamp out illiteracy, though Russian experience provides abundant evidence of the close relation between mere literacy and improved farm practices. In fact, the Government was frequently criticized for actually hindering the spreading of knowledge. The well-known economist and educator, Professor A. A. Manuilov, wrote in 1905: “The access of peasants to books was hindered to the utmost by the authorities; lectures and talks in the village, even when dealing with strictly specialized subjects, met actually almost insurmountable obstacles.”<sup>4</sup> And there was considerable other testimony in a similar vein.

<sup>4</sup> A. A. Manuilov, *Pozne nel'nyi Vopros v Rossii* [The Land Question in Russia] (Moscow, 1905), 47.

Technical assistance for small farmers was especially needed in a country like Russia with its difficult climatic conditions. It is a country suffering from frequently recurrent droughts and crop failure, bringing in their wake severe famines that aggravated still further the agrarian crisis. But instead of concentrating on the problem of improving agricultural productivity through general and technical education, and technical and credit assistance to farmers, the government policy and legislation were directed more and more towards increasing the regimentation of the peasant by the mir, and by the bureaucracy. Government policy aimed, in fact, toward tightening the legal isolation of the peasantry from the rest of the society and turning it into what an eminent Russian statesman, V. A. Maklakov, called “a kind of caste.”<sup>5</sup> I would add, an oppressed caste. All in all, the Tsarist government taught a sort of negative, but telling lesson—the lesson of how an agrarian reform should not be carried out.

Small wonder that, under such conditions, the peasants saw the root of all their difficulties in land shortage and manifested a strong land hunger. They knew of only one remedy for the low returns from their land; that was to increase their cultivated areas. Plowing up as much of his holding as possible, even at the expense of the scarce meadows and pastures, and without regard to soil erosion, leasing land from the landlords, and, less frequently, purchasing the land at a high price from the landlord or a land speculator—these were the peasant's traditional methods of expanding his crop area. This was, under existing conditions, the path of least resistance. It was easier to continue the same type of farming on a larger area than to re-organize the system of farming on the old holding for which capital and knowledge were lacking.

The leasing of land was particularly widespread. According to estimates of competent authorities, it involved more than one-third of the peasant households. Such leasing increased the total peasant allotted area by roughly a fifth.<sup>6</sup> Fierce

<sup>5</sup> V. Maklakov, “The Agrarian Problem in Russia Before the Revolution,” *The Russian Review*, 9: 3–15 (1950). Reprinted in *The Making of Modern Europe, Book Two: Waterloo to the Atomic Age*, edited by Herman Ausubel (New York, 1951), 881–895.

<sup>6</sup> V. Bazhaev, “Land Leasing,” *Polnaya Entsiklopediya Russkogo Sel'skogo Khozyaistva* [A Complete Encyclopedia of Russian Agriculture] (St. Petersburg,



competition for leasing land, however, often led to exorbitant rentals. Thus, a large number of Russian peasants became, through adversity, part-tenants, part-owners, despite the allotment of land upon emancipation.

Meantime, the peasant cast covetous eyes upon the estate land. In fact, he never ceased to hope that one day the Tsar would issue another manifesto distributing all estate land to the tillers of the soil. In such a redistribution, the Russian peasant saw his real salvation and his mind was impervious to any arguments against it no matter how sound economically they were. The communal repartitional system of ownership, with its fluid tenure and egalitarian tendencies, doubtless helped to strengthen this frame of mind. But its historic roots go back to the period of serfdom. The peasants' conception of servitude was often expressed in these words, addressed to the landlords, "We are yours but the land is ours." The peasants' memories harbored many grievances against the landlords, but the reduced holdings that accompanied emancipation especially rankled as an injustice. This injustice was the more keenly felt because the peasants often had to lease land from their former masters, perhaps the same land that they or their fathers once tilled. It is certainly symptomatic that Lenin, who was a past-master in the art of effective exploitation of popular discontent for party ends, insisted, at the turn of the century, on the inclusion in the platform of the then still united (Marxist) Socialist Democratic Party, of a somewhat un-Marxist plank for the distribution to the peasants of this so-called "cut-off" land.

Until the early years of the present century, however, the idea of the new division of estate land, though imbedded in peasant consciousness, did not go beyond rumors and vague expectations. Then the peasant temper changed radically. In 1905, following the weakening of the autocracy as a result of the unsuccessful war with Japan, serious revolutionary disturbances spread from cities to the countryside like wildfire.

To the various socialist parties that had long advocated nationalization or socialization of all land on ideological grounds, the peasant uprising was, of course, so much grist for their mill. But even the moderate liberals, represented in the

main by the Constitutional Democratic or Cadet Party, became convinced that the coexistence of large estate and small peasant farmers—an uneasy one since the Emancipation—was no longer tenable. They believed that only by distributing most of the estate land among the peasants, particularly the land leased by peasants, could be allayed the violent agrarian unrest that endangered the whole fabric of the Russian state. The moderate liberals therefore strongly advocated distribution of estate land to the peasants who were most in need.

The liberals based their proposals on the legal principle of eminent domain, which permits compulsory acquisition of private property by the State with fair compensation to the owners, when this is dictated by public interest. Emancipation Legislation of 1861 was cited as a precedent in this connection. On the economic side, the liberal attitude found support in the generally unprogressive character of Russian estate farming outside of the western provinces, where the Polish and German landlords managed their estates with a fairly high degree of efficiency and where agriculture in general had a more intensive character. Elsewhere, landlords found it often more profitable to lease the land to the peasants than to farm it with the aid of hired labor. At best landlords would employ nearby peasants to work the land with their own implements and horses. This did not bespeak an improved farm technique greatly differing from that prevailing on the peasant land, though higher crop yields per acre were obtained because of the better quality of the estate land.

Thus, Russian estate farming was no *Kulturtraeger* and the socio-economic losses of its disappearance through an orderly land reform, were not considered serious by its liberal proponents. This is a debatable issue, but, in any event, it was not primarily economic considerations but the revolutionary emergency that made the reform urgent in the eyes of the liberals. As Professor Herzenstein, the principal and most persuasive spokesman on the subject for the Cadet Party in the first Russian parliament, put it, "Now we have a conflagration and it must be extinguished. Only an increase in the [peasant] land area can extinguish it."<sup>7</sup>

1912), 12: 48; N. P. Oganovsky, *Ocherki po Ekonomicheskoi Geografii S.S.S.R.* [Essays in Economic Geography of the USSR] (2d ed., Moscow, 1924), 107.

<sup>7</sup> Speech at the session of May 19, 1906. Reprinted in *Agrarnyi Vopros V Pervoi Gosudarstvennoi Dume* [The Agrarian Question in the First Parliament] (Kiev, 1906), 56.



Bills for distribution of estate land were introduced in the first and second parliaments, or dumas, which the Tsarist government convoked in 1906 and 1907, following the Revolution of 1905. The liberal proposals for land reform involved, of course, fair compensation for the owners of estate land that was to be distributed. Such compensation was to be borne partly by the State, partly by the recipient of increased land allotments. The reform proposals also provided for exemptions and safeguards when land distribution would tend to affect production adversely, as, for instance, in cases of valuable industrial crops like sugar beets, grown primarily on estates. Land which was purchased by the peasants since Emancipation in small plots from the landlords and held in fee simple, as distinguished from the communal "allotted land," was also to be exempt from distribution. Although there were differences of opinion among liberal reformers regarding the form of ownership of estate land to be distributed, there was no question about the continuation of individual family type of farming on this land.

It may be appropriate at this point to indicate the statistical relationship between the peasant and estate land. According to the land census of 1905, about 200 million acres of land in European Russia were owned mostly by the nobility and also by the business and professional classes and the imperial family. A little more than half of this area was in less than 10,000 very large estates of over 2,700 acres each. This was the estate land, a large portion of which was proposed for distribution among the peasants. In addition, business corporations and various institutions and churches owned 20 million acres, of which probably only a small part could have been safely distributed. The peasants owned 375 million acres of "allotted" land and, in addition, over 66 million acres purchased from the landlords, or, altogether, in round figures, 440 million acres. To sum up, 130,000 private estates and the imperial family possessed about 200 million acres, or close to half as much as did the 12 million peasant households.<sup>8</sup>

Moderate advocates of land reform realized that distribution of the estates was no panacea, no cure-all for Russia's agrarian ills, but only a first step in the solution of the agrarian problem in

Russia. To the conservative opponents who claimed that division of estate land would be a palliative rather than a cure, Professor Faufman, one of the ablest and most scholarly among the moderate proponents of land reform, replied that when a seriously ill patient is suffering from a high fever it is essential, first of all, to save the patient by breaking the fever before further therapy can be administered.<sup>9</sup> This is precisely what the advocates of moderate land reform sought to accomplish in 1906-07.

To those who feared the detrimental effect of division of estates on agricultural production, on agricultural progress, the advocates of land reform pointed out: 1) that they favored certain safeguards and exemptions; 2) that, in any event, the higher production on estates was due, as I have already mentioned, in no small measure to the better quality of estate land rather than to better technique and larger capital investment; 3) that the large area of estate land leased by peasants on a short-term basis would be farmed no worse, and probably better, when it was in the peasants' permanent possession, and the payment for the land was less than the exorbitant rents formerly charged. Here, especially, the Russian liberals were on strong ground.

Nearly half a century has passed and yet, today, one often hears repeated the same fallacy about the evil effects that land reform will have on production in countries where farm tenancy is even more widespread and more oppressive than it was in Russia. However, it must be further said that the advocates of land reform fully recognized, as the writings and speeches of Kaufman, Herzenstein, Kutler, and other liberal experts and leaders demonstrated, that land redistribution must be accompanied by an all-out effort to raise the technical level of peasant agriculture, to increase production through education and through technical and credit assistance to the peasant farmers. The reformers may have been over optimistic on what could be thus accomplished. Perhaps they were too strongly influenced by the example of the intensive peasant agriculture in Denmark and other Western European countries and, in that pre-tractor age, were not sufficiently alive to the advantages of large-scale farming on the vast Russian steppes. But they rightly criticized the Government for doing nothing or very little to

<sup>8</sup> Statistical data are from I. V. Chernyshev, *Sel'skoe Khozyaistvo Dovoennoi Rossii i SSSR* [Agriculture of Prewar Russia and the U.S.S.R.] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1926), 26, 42-48.

<sup>9</sup> A. A. Kaufman, *Zemlya i Kul'tura. K Voprosy O Zemel'noi Reforme* [Land and Culture. Concerning the Question of Land Reform] (Moscow, 1906), 27.

help the peasants to improve their farming, and then advocating increased production as an alternative to land reform. I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss here the much less realistic, more radical land reform proposals of the socialist parties at the time.

Even the Government itself, when the revolutionary disturbances were at their height, toyed with the idea of land reform based on the distribution of estate properties. A bill to this effect was drafted in the winter of 1905-06 by N. N. Kutler, Minister of Agriculture in Count Witte's cabinet. But by the spring of 1906, the Government felt that it had a firm grip on the situation, and resolutely turned its back on the division of estates. The Tsarist government succeeded in crushing the revolution in 1906 and the estates were saved for their owners. Herzenstein, who championed the peasants' interests in the Parliament, was slain by the "black hundreds"—the precursors of modern Fascists. There were to be no land reforms of a liberal democratic character. And likewise—and this is highly important—*ipso facto* there was to be no genuine representative constitutional government. For the experience of the first two short-lived parliaments, dissolved by the Tsar, proved conclusively that such a government would be deeply committed to the kind of land reform that was anathema to Tsarism.

Because of this strong link between land reform and genuine constitutionalism, Russia's failure to adopt land reform before the first world war had wide repercussions, and not only in that country alone but far beyond its borders—in the arena of world history, where Russia was destined to play its fateful role. I think it is not a far-fetched speculation to say that the history of the last half century would have been vastly different if Russia had emerged from the turbulence of the early 1900's as an agrarian and political democracy—and it could not become one without becoming the other.

It is true, that the Government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Stolypin (1906-1911), carried out its own kind of agrarian reform. Its principal objective was the creation of a relatively small class of strong, independent peasant proprietors, with a firm attachment to the principles of private property and efficient farming. Such a class, it was hoped, would be an ally of large estate owners, and would act as a buffer between them and the mass of small peasant farmers. Stolypin aptly characterized this policy in his

classical phrase as the "wager" on the strong elements of the peasantry in preference to the weaker ones. In short, it was to be a sort of counter-revolution to prevent another revolutionary outburst in the village.

In pursuance of its objective the Government adopted a number of measures that, despite some faults and reservations, were, on the whole, beneficial to agricultural progress, notably: the ambitious agricultural colonization program in Asiatic Russia; the drive to consolidate the scattered, fragmented peasant holdings into single land tracts; the relaxation of restrictions on peasant property and civil rights; and the extension of credit assistance to the peasants for purchases of land from the estate owners who were anxious to dispose of their properties after the Revolution of 1905.

However, the keystone of the Stolypin reform was not found in such progressive measures but rather in an attack on the mir, the institution of communal land tenure.<sup>10</sup> Here was a drastic reversal of tsarist agrarian policy. The protection of the mir was one of the basic tenets of this policy prior to 1906, when this institution was considered a conservative bulwark in the village. Although, paradoxically, a large section of Russian socialists, the Narodniki, who made the mir the alpha and omega of their philosophy, held exactly the opposite view. The Revolution of 1905 disillusioned the Tsarist government about the mir's role as guardian of the status quo in the countryside. The Government now saw in the mir, with its egalitarian tendencies and its shielding of the economically weak elements of the peasantry, an obstacle to the creation of a class of individual peasant proprietors on whom it could depend.

The mir, therefore, must go, whatever the wishes of the peasant masses. Its fiscal functions were ended with the cancellation of redemption payments in 1907 and the abolition of the collective liability for taxes by 1905. The legislation adopted for this purpose has been described in detail by competent scholars.<sup>11</sup> I think the significance of

<sup>10</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the mir, see Lazar Volin, "The Peasant Household Under the Mir and the Kolkhoz in Modern Russian History," *The Cultural Approach to History*, edited by Caroline F. Ware for the American Historical Association. (New York, 1940), 125-139.

<sup>11</sup> G. T. Robinson, *Rural Russia Under the Old Regime* (New York, 1932), George Pavlovsky, *Agricultural Russia on the Eve of the Revolution* (London, 1930).

the Stolypin land legislation was well epitomized by the eminent Russian historian and statesman, Paul Milukov: "Stolypin proposed his own landlord tainted reform in opposition to those democratic proposals which led to the dissolution of the first two Russian parliaments. The Stolypin reform tried to divert peasants from the division of the land of the nobles by the division of their own land for the benefit of the most prosperous part of the peasantry."<sup>12</sup>

Thus, the Stolypin reform, though in many respects progressive, lacked the basic appeal to the discontented peasant masses that the liberal proposals for land reform possessed. It could not, therefore, conciliate Russian peasantry, at least not within the short period before another political crisis occurred. I may add here, that both the internal political and the external international situations strongly pointed toward the likelihood of such a crisis.

The estate owners merely won a Pyrrhic victory. As soon as the monarchy was overthrown, in 1917, the agrarian problem again came to the fore as a phoenix rising from its own ashes. The alternatives now were a land reform, sponsored by democratic socialists, still orderly, but more radical in character than in 1906, or an agrarian revolution aided and abetted by Lenin and Company. For Lenin, the orthodox Marxist, a peasant revolution was a temporary opportunistic expedient in the bid for power. For this purpose, he stooped to borrow from the ideological arsenal of his anti-

Marxist and peasantophile opponents, the Socialist Revolutionaries.

Speed now was essential to any orderly democratic agrarian reform, but this made its accomplishment so much more difficult under the chaotic conditions prevailing in the summer of 1917. The overthrow of the Kerensky government by the Bolsheviks cleared the path for an agrarian revolution, which actually began in the form of widespread peasant disturbances even before the Bolshevik coup. In the process of wholesale land redistribution, not only the estate system was liquidated, but also the larger peasant holdings, and especially the class of new peasant proprietors created by the Stolypin legislation. For the peasant masses, however, this was also a Pyrrhic victory. In a little more than a decade, they too were dragooned into the state-controlled kolkhozy after a gruesome struggle that took a terrific toll of human life and economic wealth from the Russian countryside.<sup>13</sup> Thus, Russia, which demonstrated the tragic consequences of its failure to carry out a timely democratic land reform, was destined to teach the world still another lesson, namely, the futility of the Communist land reform to create an agrarian order that would be in harmony with the historic aspirations of the peasant masses for land and liberty.

<sup>13</sup> See Lazar Volin, *A Survey of Soviet Russian Agriculture* (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Monograph 5, Washington D.C., 1951), 194 pages; Lazar Volin, "Soviet Agricultural Collectivism in Peace and War," *American Economic Review*, (Papers and Proceedings of the 63rd annual meeting of the American Economic Association) 41, no. 2, p. 465-474 (May, 1951).

<sup>12</sup> Paul Milukov, "A Republic or a Monarchy," *Krestyankaya Rossiya* 4: 54 (Prague, 1923).

## LAND TENURE AND LAND REFORM IN MODERN MEXICO

MERRILL RIPPY

*Texas Christian University*

Although it is universally recognized as bad strategy to begin a discourse with an apology, it is perhaps permissible when so adequate an excuse has been made available by a predecessor who attempted to deal with this subject.<sup>1</sup> Marco An-

tonio Durán stated eloquently the difficulties which face anyone attempting to deal with the agrarian problem of Mexico when he said,

Without any false modesty, I must confess that neither my capacity nor the time at my disposal, are sufficient to cover entirely the ambitious title of this dissertation. The agrarian problem is so complex, it can be considered from so many points of view, and so many factors intervene in economic-agricultural phenomena,

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the joint meeting of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association at Washington, D.C., December 28, 1952.

hat the simple study of such a problem would fill an entire life.<sup>2</sup>

It is easy to agree with one of Mexico's recent Ministers of Agriculture that the Mexican experience with an agrarian problem has been one of the most important in the modern world, and that the essence of the history of Mexico since 1810 has been the struggle to solve the problem of the possession of land.<sup>3</sup>

The problem of land, as González Roa has said, was the fundamental problem of Mexico, and until it was solved, it was useless to think of incorporating the great mass of the people of Mexico into the civilization of the West.<sup>4</sup>

It was not until the twentieth century that the great domains were broken up. That step, in spite of inevitable errors of execution and the economic and social trouble accompanying so profound a transformation, was the first decisive move toward integrating rural Mexico into the modern world.<sup>5</sup> During 35 years of effort the agrarian reform has not given Mexico all that was hoped for, perhaps, as one distinguished Mexican publisher declared recently, because it was incomplete, inconsequential, timid, slow, and never gave all the farm workers sufficient land, credit, irrigation, or technical aid. Possibly the agrarian reform in Mexico simply liquidated one semi-feudal institution, the *latifundia*, and in a supreme aspiration for social justice granted to the peasant ejidal lands which in a little while were no more than anachronistic institutions themselves. Or it may be, as a recent President of Mexico has declared, that the purpose of the revolution was never the impoverishment of a few in order to enrich others but plainly and simply the just redistribution of land. Toward that objective, it can be said without quibble, Mexico did move.<sup>6</sup>

Until 1857 the Mexican system of landholding

<sup>2</sup> Marco Antonio Durán, "El Problema Agrario y Nuestra Economía Agrícola," *Jornadas*, 55: 9 (1945).

<sup>3</sup> Mario Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias de México," *Revista de Economía* 12: 312 (1949).

<sup>4</sup> Fernando González Roa, *El Aspecto Agrario de la Revolución Mexicana* (México, 1919), 7-8.

<sup>5</sup> Francois Chevalier, *La Formation des Grands Domaines au Mexique: Terre et Société aux XVI et XVII Siècles* (Paris, 1952), 409.

<sup>6</sup> Editorial in *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México*, 3: 6 (1951); Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 25; Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946 (México, 1946), quoting President Manuel Avila Camacho.

was marked generally by three characteristic forms of tenure: the hacienda, the rancho, and the *ejido*. The haciendas as a type were similar to the Roman *latifundia*, complete economic units of vast extent, using a large dependent labor force. The hacienda always covered at least 2,500 acres and some, according to Viceroy Revilla Gigedo in 1794, were large enough to be entire kingdoms in Europe.<sup>7</sup> The farm workers, usually peons, labored on the haciendas and earned so little that they had to buy on credit from the *hacendados'* stores. Once in debt to the stores, the peon was prohibited by law from leaving his employer until the debt was paid; such debts were inheritable by sons from fathers.<sup>8</sup>

The number of haciendas in 1810 has been estimated at 4,944; the number grew steadily thereafter, being estimated in 1854 at 6,092 and in 1910 at 8,245. Only 840 *hacendados* were listed in the census of 1910. Apparently many owners had more than one hacienda.<sup>9</sup> The growth of haciendas after 1857 was due in part to the effects of the reform laws of the Juárez era, which had, using liberal economic theory, ordered communal lands in *ejidos* to be given to each communal holder as private property. The result was generally that the Indian smallholders, not understanding the nature of ownership of land, took money from neighboring *hacendados* for their land titles.<sup>10</sup>

Another factor in the growth of the haciendas, however, was the opening of the public lands of Mexico to private ownership by an act of 1883 which permitted surveying companies to receive one third of the public land they surveyed in payment for their work. Within 20 years the surveying companies had acquired 68,750,000 acres or 13 percent of Mexico's surface, although the companies were made up of only 29 persons, all high in official circles.<sup>11</sup> Subsequent acts in 1886 and 1894 speeded the passage of public lands into the hands of *hacendados*.

By 1906 one *hacendado*, General Luis Terrazas,

<sup>7</sup> George M. McBride, *The Land Systems of Mexico* (New York, 1923), 60.

<sup>8</sup> Jesus Silva Herzog, "La Concentración Agraria en México," *Cuadernos Americanos*, 42: 182 (March-April, 1952).

<sup>9</sup> J. H. Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana: The History of Land and Agriculture in Ancient and Modern Mexico* (London, 1926), 65; McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, 62, 68; Silva Herzog, "La Concentración Agraria," 185.

<sup>10</sup> Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 68.

<sup>11</sup> McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, 73; Silva Herzog, "La Concentración Agraria," 182.



had an estate in Chihuahua that was larger than Costa Rica, and eight other persons were owners of 56,250,000 acres. Fifteen haciendas covered an area of 247,000 acres each.<sup>12</sup>

The rancho, another predominant type of Mexican landholding, was an estate of less than 2,500 acres. It was nevertheless an estate, most often over 1,250 acres in area. The *rancheros* represented the nearest approach in prerevolutionary land tenure to a middle-class variety of farmer. Their numbers increased from 6,684 in 1810 to 15,085 in 1854 and reached 47,939 in 1910.<sup>13</sup>

The *ejido*, the third predominant kind of landholding in Mexico prior to the revolution, was so called by the Spaniards after an institution of their own which resembled an Indian custom, the *altepetalli*. Among the Indians, pueblos owned lands in common which the inhabitants cultivated individually, each family having a parcel of land which it used freely so long as it was not abused but which could not be sold or mortgaged. This institution the Spaniards identified with the Hispanic common used for pasture and timber, and after 1573 the Spanish term *ejido* was applied to the Indian practice which was recognized legally by the Crown.<sup>14</sup>

*Ejid*os were guessed to number 4,777 in 1810 and increased to 5,021 by 1854. After 1857, however, they began to disappear rapidly as the law forbidding civil corporations to own land was applied to them. The *ejidatarios*, with some exception, had disappeared by 1910 among the 3,096,827 farm workers and the 400,000 farm owners having less than 12 acres of land.<sup>15</sup>

Despite the fact that in 1910 only about 500,000 Mexican farmers owned land, out of a farming population of 3,500,000, and despite the fact that the 840 *hacendados* owned by far the greater part of the land, the beginning of the revolution in 1910 was not based upon any program for agrarian

reform.<sup>16</sup> Although Morelos in 1810 had suggested land reform in his "Proyecto de Confiscación de Intereses Europeos y Americanas," proposing the confiscation of all haciendas having over 8,878 acres of cultivated land,<sup>17</sup> Madero scarcely mentioned land reform in 1910.

It was Emiliano Zapata who set the agrarian pattern for the Mexican revolution by proposing the confiscation of one third of the big landed estates and the distribution of the land among the peons by restitution and gifts. After the Plan de Ayala of November 1911, Madero gave the Caja de Préstamos authority to divide large holdings and attempted to begin a program for the development of the national lands.<sup>18</sup> Madero moved too late, however, and was destroyed by the counter-revolution of Huerta.

The northern branch of the revolution, destined to be the principal revolutionary force in Mexico, did not adopt an agrarian program for revolutionary action until the Convention of Aguascalientes, after 1913. There the Plan de Ayala was accepted as a clear and precise guide for the foundation of agrarian reform, and it first became plain to all that the revolution in Mexico was not only for *Sufragio Efectivo y No Reección* but also and primarily for economic justice.<sup>19</sup>

The national agrarian policy of the revolution in Mexico began with Carranza's Decree of January 6, 1915, which declared all lands alienated illegally from pueblos or other population centers since 1856 subject to restitution if the deprived towns could establish their titles. A National Agrarian Commission and lesser local committees were set up to hear claims, verify them, survey and identify the land involved, and restore title to the pueblos.<sup>20</sup>

The culmination of the legalization of land reform as a basic tenet of the revolution was Article 27 of the Constitution of Querétaro of 1917. The article provided the permanent con-

<sup>12</sup> Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 67; Silva Herzog, "La Concentración Agraria," 186; Rafael López Ocampo, "La Ley de Colonización y el Problema de la Tierra en México," *Los Problemas Agrícolas de México*, 1: 221 (1934); Roberto Bruce Brinsmade, *El Latifundismo Mexicano: Su Origen y Su Remedio* (México, 1916), 11.

<sup>13</sup> McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, 89, 91, 98.

<sup>14</sup> Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 17-19; Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias," 312.

<sup>15</sup> McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, 131-132; Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 65-66, 69-70.

<sup>16</sup> Silva Herzog, "La Concentración Agraria," 185.

<sup>17</sup> López Ocampo, "Ley de Colonización," 221.

<sup>18</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 82-83.

<sup>19</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; *Seis Años de Gobierno al Servicio de México, 1934-1940* (México, 1940), 325.

<sup>20</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias," 314; State of San Luis Potosí, *Leyes de Ejidos y Leves para el Fraccionamiento de las Grandes Propiedades. Leyes Agrarias* (San Luis Potosí, 1922), 4-5.

stitutional obligation to break up the *latifundia*, to develop small landholdings, to create new centers of population provided with land and water, to foster agriculture, and to provide towns and communities which needed land and water with an adequate amount of each, expropriating them from nearby large properties.<sup>21</sup>

Although Article 27 was not rigidly enforced immediately, it was partially implemented in 1918 by a law which declared the cultivation of arable lands to be of public utility and authorized municipalities to assume temporary possession of unused lands to force their cultivation by renting them for cash or shares without depriving the proprietor of title.<sup>22</sup>

It was not until December 1921 that the enforcement of Article 27 was ordered by President Obregón, who further decreed in April, 1922, that all population centers not having *ejidos* could apply for lands and that each *ejidatario* was entitled to seven to eleven acres of irrigated land or its equivalent in other land available; otherwise, the amount could be cut by half. Properties not representing a concentration of more than 225 acres of irrigated land or its equivalent were exempt from expropriation for distribution, as were all agricultural units, buildings, and fruit farms, coffee, cocoa, vanilla, or rubber plantations. Mexicans excluded from ejidal claims included all professional workers, proprietors having land equal to or greater in size than the ejidal grant, persons owning capital greater than one thousand pesos, and civil service employees earning more than 75 pesos a month. A National Agrarian Commission of three agronomists and two civil engineers was named to carry out the program, along with similar local committees.<sup>23</sup>

In 1922 the National Agrarian Commission, in Circular 51, recommended that all *ejidos* should practise co-operative exploitation of land. The distribution of the national land to settlers was provided for in the Decree of August 23, 1923, which gave every Mexican over eighteen the right freely to acquire private property in the national lands, within limitations fixed by law.<sup>24</sup> The policy of co-operative exploitation of *ejidos* was aban-

doned in 1925 by a law which provided for the division of *ejidos* into privately utilized parcels leaving the *ejidatarios* free to adopt the form of organization which suited them. In a few instances the *ejidos* were divided by legal order, but in the majority of cases the division was made by the *ejidatarios* themselves.<sup>25</sup>

Between 1925 and 1934 settlements, communities, and ranches obtained the same right to ejidal lands as that possessed by population centers. Landholders whose lands had been unjustly expropriated for ejidal purposes were permitted to claim damages when their land was restored; those deprived of their land permanently were granted indemnity from the Agrarian Fund in 6 percent bonds redeemable in 20 years. Compensation was based upon the fiscal evaluation of land plus 10 percent.<sup>26</sup> A national bank of ejidal credit was established in 1926 to aid *ejidatarios* in the development of their lands. *Ejidatarios* were given representation on the mixed agrarian commissions in each state in 1934. The same year the division of *ejidos* into parcels was established as a policy, and the first agrarian code was drawn up, reiterating the right to land and water and forests of any population nucleus deprived of such.<sup>27</sup>

In 1936 those *ejidos* which required heavy capital investment in industrial processes to prepare crops for market were collectivized. However, ranchos up to 125,000 acres in area were exempt from ejidal expropriations if the owner possessed 300 milch cows or their equivalent. Small property in fruit or henequen farms up to 750 acres was exempt. Small property holding was also encouraged by the ordering of all land titles received from the old surveying companies to be validated under the "homestead law" of 1923. Furthermore a vigorous policy of colonization of public lands was adopted after 1935.<sup>28</sup>

A new agrarian code was promulgated in 1940. It entitled each *ejidatario* to 10 acres of irrigated

<sup>25</sup> "Cooperación y Crédito: Banco Nacional de Crédito Ejidal, S.A.," *Boletín Mensual de la Dirección de Economía Rural*, 228: 332 (1945).

<sup>26</sup> Retinger, *Tierra Mexicana*, 96.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*; and Francisco Vázquez Pérez, *Derecho Agrario 1912-1942* (México, 1945), 39-41.

<sup>28</sup> Mario Sousa, "La Explotación Agrícola en la U.R.S.S. y en México," *Sociedad Agronómica de México, Primer Ciclo de Conferencias*, 23; Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 13; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 116-120.

<sup>21</sup> Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias," 313.

<sup>22</sup> Helen Phipps, *Some Aspects of the Agrarian Question in Mexico: A Historical Study* (Austin, 1925), 147.

<sup>23</sup> State of San Luis Potosí, *Leyes de Ejidos*, 18-21.

<sup>24</sup> Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 13; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 115.

land or its equivalent, and enlarged "small property," i.e., the amount secure from expropriation, to include 250 acres of irrigated land or its equivalent. The code specified that agrarian rights belonged to the nucleus of population, not to individuals, and that exploitation should be conducted by the best socio-economic plan. Collective use was preferred where all factors were equal.<sup>29</sup>

The further development of small property was undertaken in 1945 by the establishment of service co-operatives of small and medium proprietors linked to the Bank of Farm Credit. A new definition of small property was made a part of the Constitution in 1946 and agrarian commissions were held liable for unconstitutional acts if they made ejidal grants affecting such properties. This strengthened the position of the small proprietors and made credit more easily available.<sup>30</sup> The agrarian code was revised further in 1946 to extend the benefits of credit, organization, and other plans previously restricted to *ejidatarios* to the proprietors of land parcels no greater in size than the unit of land given to the *ejidatario*.<sup>31</sup>

The drastic revisions of the Agrarian Code of 1940 led to the issuance of a new code in 1950. The Code of 1950 refused ejidal grants to population nuclei containing fewer than 20 persons entitled to ejidal parcels, and to cities of more than ten thousand if fewer than 150 persons were eligible for land rights. All property not meeting the definition of small property and within 4.3 miles of the densest part of the town soliciting an ejidal grant was subject to expropriation for ejidal purposes; and each *ejidatario* was entitled to fifteen acres of irrigated land or its equivalent. Ejidal property in land, pasture, and water was declared to be divisible on petition of the *ejidatarios*, but the kind of exploitation of the property of the *ejido* was to be determined by the President.<sup>32</sup>

The Agrarian Code of 1950 made little distinc-

<sup>29</sup> *Código Agrario de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos* (1940), 28, 39, 52; Vázquez Pérez, *Derecho Agrario*, 47.

<sup>30</sup> "Cooperación y Crédito," 336; Manuel Andrade, ed., *Leyes y Reglamentos sobre Aguas, Bosques, Colonización, Minas y Petróleo* (México, 1948).

<sup>31</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria del Primer Congreso Nacional Revolucionario de Derecho Agrario* (México, 1946), 196.

<sup>32</sup> *Código Agrario de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Ley de Colonización; y Reglamento de Inafectabilidad* (1950), 27-29.

tion between the *ejidatario* and the small proprietor. Each was entitled to equal aids and services from the national government and each received the same protection of the law for his property and the fruits of his labor.<sup>33</sup>

How did the laws of agrarian reform work in Mexico? The data on land distributed and persons receiving grants indicates that they worked slowly but with cumulative force until 1940. In 1916, the first year of the National Agrarian Commission, 182 peasants received lands. In the first seven years of the reform, 1915-1922, during which the federal government did little more than restore land and declare that forests were not to be destroyed, 376 pueblos received ejidal grants benefiting 85,947 peasants with 1,132,582 acres.<sup>34</sup>

After seven years of land reform, however, the privately owned farm area was 252,325,000 acres, held by 453,661 proprietors out of a population of 14,334,000, of which 74.7 percent was rural. Only 1.3 percent of rural families owned 63 percent of all privately held land and 85 percent of the value of all farm properties. Half of Mexico's privately owned farms in 1922 belonged to 2,683 landowners.<sup>35</sup>

The annual grants to *ejidos* increased steadily from 1923 to 1929, rising from 643,870 acres to 2,501,500. In 1929 some 104,829 peasants received lands, and although distribution of lands dropped sharply after 1929, and by the end of 1934 some 697,188 peasants in 4,170 pueblos had been granted since 1922 over 18,310,000 acres. In 1930, after 15 years of agrarian reform, Mexico's private farm area had grown to 307,500,000 acres, and the number of private farms had increased to 854,000. However, 2.5 percent of the farms covered 85 percent of the land. Far more than half the farms

<sup>33</sup> *Temas Mexicanos. Primer Informe del Presidente Alemán (Primero de Septiembre de 1947)* (México, 1951), 70.

<sup>34</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria, 1945-1946*; Julián Rodríguez Adame, "El Problema Agrario Mexicano v la Maquinización Agrícola," *Jornadas*, no. 55, p. 50; Secretaría de Economía, Dirección General de Estadística, *Anuario Estadístico de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos*, 1942 (México, 1940), 902. The average *ejido* in that period was 6,332 acres, a little more than the old square league for ejidal pastures of the Spanish royal cédula of 1573; McBride, *Land Systems of Mexico*, 161.

<sup>35</sup> José S. Noriega, *Diversos Aspectos del Problema Agrario* (n.p., 1931?), 48-49; Eyler N. Simpson, *The Ejido: Mexico's Way Out* (Chapel Hill, 1937), 586-87.

averaged less than five acres in area, and 97 percent of the land was still in *latifundia*. As late as 1930 probably 30 persons owned all the state of Morelia. Only 7 percent of the farm land was in *ejidos*, which covered 20,861,627 acres, one third of which was crop land.<sup>36</sup>

There were 3,626,278 rural workers in Mexico in 1930, most of whom were entitled to ejidal rights, but 67 percent of the farm owners had less than eleven acres each of irrigated land or its equivalent, and also were entitled to ejidal grants. Yet Mexico had only 36,250,000 acres of crop land in the entire country, about half of which was in cultivation in 1930, and 85 percent of which was owned by nineteen thousand holders.<sup>37</sup>

The revelations of the 1930 census were followed by a reinvigorated land reform program beginning in 1935. Cancellation of land concessions restored 4,393,942 acres to the state between 1934-1940 and vigorous colonization of national lands brought 2,974,295 acres into use, but the break-up of *latifundia* was the chief problem attacked.<sup>38</sup>

*Ejidatarios* were aided in the development of their lands by the Banco Nacional de Crédito Ejidal, founded in 1935, and the Departamento Agrario, established in 1934. Seventy-two percent of all ejidal grants made up to 1943 were issued during the years 1935 to 1943, and 54 percent of the peasants who obtained land from 1916 to 1943 obtained it during the same period. Moreover, the average parcel of crop land per *ejidatario* rose to 16.2 acres after 1934.<sup>39</sup>

Grants of land to *ejidos* reached a peak in 1937 when 12,541,787 acres were given to *ejidatarios*.

<sup>36</sup> Rodríguez Adame, "El Problema Agrario," 50; Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; *Anuario Estadístico*, 1942, p. 827, 902; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 111, 327; E. Alanís Patiño, "La Producción Ejidal de Morelos," Sociedad Agronómica de México, *Primer Ciclo de Conferencias*, 65; Gilberto Fabila, "La Producción Ejidal frente a la Producción Agrícola Privada," *Los Problemas Agrícolas de México*, 2: 403-04; Simpson, *The Ejido*, 619; Secretaría de Economía Nacional, *La Reforma Agraria en México*; (México, 1937); Dirección General de Estadística, *Compendio Estadístico*, 1947 (México, 1947), 248-49.

<sup>37</sup> Fabila, "La Producción Ejidal," 354, 403-04; Nathan L. Whetten, *Rural Mexico* (Chicago, 1948), 180; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 338.

<sup>38</sup> *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 112-113.

<sup>39</sup> Rodríguez Adame, "El Problema Agrario," 572; Departamento Agrario, *Memoria del Primer Congreso*, 127.

By the end of 1940 some 46 percent of Mexico's crop land and 22 percent of all farm land were in *ejidos*. *Ejidatarios* were 41.8 percent of all rural workers in 1940. There were 14,618 *ejidos* averaging 61.2 acres of all types of land per *ejidatario* and 15.5 acres of crop land. Over 2,500 older *ejidos* had been enlarged by new grants.<sup>40</sup>

The effects of the agrarian program on privately owned farm lands were equally widespread. Between 1930 and 1940 the number of small properties (less than 2,500 acres) increased 44 percent. The number of farms of less than 11 acres in 1930 was 576,588; in 1940 it was 928,593. The average size of these farms was under five acres in both years taken. In 1930 the number of farms having not more than 11 acres was 67.5 percent of all farms; in 1940 the percentage was 76.2. Of all farms in Mexico in 1940, those having no more than 1,250 acres were 98.7 percent of the total, although they covered only 16.3 percent of the privately owned farm area of 251,445,000 acres. That is to say, even in 1940 some 1,203,145 farms covered 40,715,000 acres while 15,784 farms covered 210,730,000 acres. However, the large farms were principally ranches without cultivatable lands. Of 290,336 farms having more than 11 acres, 56,842 had no crop land at all and the other 233,494 large farms averaged only 71.5 acres of crop land each. The 2,893,212 acres in farms having not more than 11 acres were 80 percent crop land.<sup>41</sup>

There was a noticeable slowing down of expansion of the ejidal program after 1940. The annual average number of persons receiving ejidal grants between 1941-1946 was the smallest since 1915-

<sup>40</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; *Anuario Estadístico*, 1942, p. 792, 902; *Compendio Estadístico*, 1947, p. 188, 199, 205; Departamento Agrario, *Memoria del Primer Congreso*, 207; Whetten, *Rural Mexico*, 594-97; Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 30; John A. Hopkins, "Los Salarios y la Productividad del Trabajo Agrícola en México," *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México*, 1: 182, Vázquez Pérez, *Derecho Agrario*, 54.

<sup>41</sup> *Compendio Estadístico*, 1947, p. 248-49, 777; U.S. Tariff Commission, *Economic Controls and Commercial Policy in Mexico* (Washington, 1946), 20; Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 38; Whetten, *Rural Mexico*, 180; Hopkins, "Los Salarios," 182; Comisión Económica para América Latina de las Naciones Unidas, "El Desarrollo Económico de México," *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México*, 3: 143. The title of the Economic Commission is cited below as CEPAL.



1920. The establishment of new centers of farm population dropped from an average of eight per year before 1940 to one each year afterwards. The number of *ejidatarios* increased between 1946-1949 somewhat, but still at a slower rate than for any other period of the reform after 1920 excepting 1941-1946. The number of *ejidos* functioning in 1949 was 16,382, the largest number to that date; over 53.2 percent of the total crop land in Mexico was in *ejidos*. The Bank of Ejidal Credit increased its activities vigorously between 1947-1950, the number of ejidal credit societies under the Bank increasing 74 percent, membership in the societies expanding 200 percent, and the credit lent growing 11 percent.<sup>42</sup>

It was officially declared in 1946 that holding privately owned small farm property was not to be considered as contrary to the principles of the Mexican revolution. Certificates of exemption from the agrarian laws were issued much more freely. Moreover, the Bank of Farm Credit lent almost as much to small proprietors in 1948 as the Bank of Ejidal Credit lent to ejidal credit societies.<sup>43</sup>

Between 1947 and 1950 the number of acres under cultivation rose 28 percent, a good part of which increase was due to a vigorous program of irrigation development undertaken in Mexico after 1940. Undoubtedly the dynamic role in contemporary Mexican agriculture has been played by the great irrigation projects. By 1950 over 2,500,000 acres had been brought under irrigation since 1940; and 25 percent of all crop land cultivated in 1950 was irrigated.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 38; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 338; Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias," 314-15; CEPAL, "El Desarrollo Económico," 145; *Temas Mexicanos*, 71; Banco Nacional de Crédito Ejidal, S.A., *Informe*, 1949, p. 11, and *Informe*, 1950, p. 32-71.

<sup>43</sup> Departamento Agrario, *Memoria*, 1945-1946; "El Problema Agrario," 38; *Seis Años de Gobierno*, 338; CEPAL, "El Desarrollo Económico," 145; *Temas Mexicanos*, 71; Sousa, "Realizaciones Agrarias," 315; Banco Nacional de Crédito Ejidal, S.A., *Informe*, 1949, p. 9-11.

<sup>44</sup> Secretaría de Agricultura y Ganadería, *Boletín Mensual de la Dirección de Economía Rural* (March, 1952), 63; Marte R. Gómez, "Los Riegos en México," and E. Alanís Patiño, "Los Riegos en México," *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México*, 2:40, 53;

Production on *ejidos* receiving loans from the Bank of Ejidal Credit rose 1,800 percent in value between 1936-1950 and the area harvested grew 270 percent. Overall Mexican farm production was 49.4 higher in 1945-1947 than in 1925-1929, an increase slightly greater than the population increase for the same period. Utilizing the least favorable index, that of 1903-1907, as the norm, Mexican production in 1940-1944 was 72 for corn, 138 for wheat, 398 for rice, 93 for beans, 2,081 for tomatoes, 933 for bananas, 145 for cotton, 336 for sugar cane, and 116 for henequen. More significantly, perhaps, the Mexican return per acre for corn in 1945 made it possible to produce as much corn as in 1900 on a million acres less land; similarly, more wheat was harvested on fewer acres in 1944 than in 1900.<sup>45</sup>

Since 1940 Mexican agricultural production has expanded far beyond the 1900 level and at an increasing rate for most crops; moreover, a greater diversity of crops has been produced without serious loss, if any, in the production of traditional crops. At the same time, a tremendous redistribution of land has taken place and great expansion of technological agriculture has been achieved.

Even though in 1949 a Mexican commentator could say that the vices and injustices of a social system based on peonage still frustrated the establishment of democratic institutions and maintained the practices of government on a dolorous plane of *caciquismo*, no longer was it valid to apply to the land system of Mexico in 1950 the words of Rome's Tiberius Gracchus—as was done in the early revolution:<sup>46</sup>

The beasts have their dens, but the men who struggle and die for Italy are left nothing more than the air and the light of the sky. . . . They are called lords of the earth and yet cannot call their own a single clod of it.

Durán, "El Problema Agrario," 159; Simpson, *The Ejido*, 607; CEPAL, "El Desarrollo Económico," 120, 142.

<sup>45</sup> CEPAL, "El Desarrollo Económico," 118-19; Banco Nacional de Crédito Ejidal, S.A., *Informe*, 1949, p. 39, and *Informe*, 1950, p. 59; *Compendio Estadístico*, 1947, p. 293, 295, 548; Whetten, *Rural Mexico*, 253.

<sup>46</sup> Narciso Bassals, "Estudiemus la Cuestión Agraria," *Revista de Economía*, 12:6 (1949); Noriega, *Diversos Aspectos*, 65.

# LAND TENURE IN IRELAND IN THE MODERN PERIOD

LEONARD F. CAIN

*Department of Economics, The Catholic University of America*

*Introduction.* The Constitution of Ireland, adopted July 1, 1937, contains a section entitled Directive Principles of Social Policy.<sup>1</sup> These principles are set down to guide Parliament in framing legislation. One of them provides that the State shall, in particular, direct its policy to the end "that there may be established on the land in economic security as many families as in the circumstances shall be practicable."<sup>2</sup>

The inclusion of this directive in the basic law of the nation emphasizes the importance attached to the land in the minds of the Irish people. But it is not surprising in view of the centuries of struggle waged by Irishmen to regain control of the land of which they had been so largely dispossessed.

"In Ireland . . .," it has recently been asserted, "the land has been more than a factor of production, It has a special place in the Irish mind and the long struggle of the people for the land has left a lasting impact on Irish history and politics."<sup>3</sup>

It is not our purpose here to recount all the details of this oft-told story. But it is essential to an understanding of the course of the land tenure programs that there be an appreciation of the devotion of the Irish to the land, and of the close and continuous connection between the fight for the land and the fight for national independence. Both battles have been all but won: the declaration of the Republic in 1948 left only the partitioned six counties of the northeast still under British authority; the succession of land purchase and related laws has resulted in the transfer of nearly all the agricultural land to owner-occupiers. Happily the problems which must yet be resolved before the latter task is complete are much less formidable than that of ending Partition.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association in Washington, D. C., on December 28, 1952.

<sup>2</sup> *Constitution of Ireland*, Article 45, 2, v.

<sup>3</sup> "The Irish Economy: Retrospect and Prospect," *Economic Survey of the Republic of Ireland*, supplement to *The Statist* (London, 1951), 2.

Before proceeding with the story of how the land has been restored to the people, however, it is necessary to relate a few fundamental economic facts about the country and its agriculture.<sup>4</sup>

*Ireland and its Land.* The total area of the Republic of Ireland is seventeen million statute acres, of which some eleven million statute acres are devoted to agricultural production.<sup>5</sup> Pasturage is by far the principal use to which the land is put, with hay and corn the principal crops, as Table 1 shows.

TABLE 1  
Total Acreage Under Crops (1949)<sup>6</sup>

	Acres
Corn.....	1,213,000
Root and Green.....	662,000
Flax.....	15,000
Fruit.....	13,000
<i>Total</i> .....	1,903,000
Hay.....	2,000,000
Pasture.....	7,680,000
<i>Total Crops and Pasturage</i> .....	11,583,000
Other land.....	5,441,000
<i>Total Area</i> .....	17,024,000

More than half of Ireland's three million people live on the land, operating some 380,000 farms. Most of these are small holdings; 280,000 of them contain less than 50 acres.<sup>7</sup> The average of all farms is about 30 acres.<sup>8</sup> In fact, any farm greater

<sup>4</sup> The six-county area of Northern Ireland is excluded from direct consideration in this study for two reasons; (1) the land problem was never as acute in this area as elsewhere, for historical reasons discussed below; and (2) since 1923 and Partition, legislation and policy have differed in the two jurisdictions.

<sup>5</sup> "Rural Organization in Ireland," *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 53.

<sup>6</sup> *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 80.

<sup>7</sup> "Rural Organization in Ireland," *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 53.

<sup>8</sup> Joseph Johnston, "An Outlook on Irish Agriculture," Part 2, *Studies*, 28: 387 (September, 1939).

than 50 acres is considered a "large farm." A grass farm of 100 acres or more is termed a "ranch."<sup>9</sup>

Agriculture is the principal source of employment also. Despite the policy of industrialization pursued by the Government during the past two decades, the 1946 census revealed that almost half the employed persons were engaged in agricultural tasks, a slight decline from previous years. Some 575,000 persons were so employed out of a total of 1,228,000 at work. The details are given in Table 2.

There is a noticeable trend from agriculture to industry, trade, and the professions, but no one

in the form of food, as payment for the services of the latter in managing the affairs of the clan. This practice, which endured for centuries, engendered a firm conviction in the minds of the people that they had a secure right to continued use and occupation of the particular plot of land which they needed and were accustomed to cultivate.<sup>12</sup>

With the coming of the Normans, after their conquest of England, the tenure policies of feudalism came into being. These were applied in the part of Ireland directly under the Anglo-Norman nobles, while the ancient customs were adhered

TABLE 2  
*Industrial Distribution Persons (14 years and over) at Work<sup>10</sup>*

Group	Numbers (000)			Percentage		
	1926	1936	1946	1926	1936	1946
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.....	652	613	575	53.4	49.6	46.8
Mining and Quarrying.....	2	3	3	.1	.2	.2
Manufacturing.....	157	199	205	12.9	16.2	16.7
Transportation and Communications.....	39	38	43	3.2	3.1	3.5
Commerce and Finance.....	114	127	128	9.4	10.3	10.4
Public Administration and Defense.....	76	78	89	6.3	6.3	7.3
Professions.....	39	44	51	3.2	3.5	4.2
Personal Service.....	127	122	113	10.4	9.9	9.2
Entertainment and Sports.....	5	7	10	.4	.5	.8
Other Industries.....	9	5	11	.7	.4	.9
Total at Work.....	1,220	1,236	1,228	100.0	100.0	100.0

seriously thinks that the former will ever lose its dominant place in the Irish economy. In fact, as will be made clear later, much of Ireland's attention in the past few years has been devoted to increasing the efficiency and productivity of her farms so as to make her contribution toward feeding the hungry of the world, as well as to boost her exports, 80 percent of which are agricultural products.<sup>11</sup> This last aim is vital since Ireland needs many goods which can only be obtained through trade.

*Origin and Nature of the Land Problem in Ireland.* In early Irish history, according to the code of the ancient Brehon Law, the land belonged to the clan, with each freeman of the clan having the right to use a share of it, without interference, as long as he lived and continued to work it. In turn, he paid dues to the chief of the clan, principally

to in the more remote areas. The reaction to the new feudal procedure is described as follows:

This system was most unwelcome to the Irish occupiers of land. They objected to having the chief of their own choice supplanted by a stranger who did not follow their ways and who often seemed to them cruel. The substitution of feudal services for the former food levies they found incomprehensible and abnoxious. And, above all, any attempt to remove them from their holdings was abhorrent to them as the violation of an inalienable right.<sup>12</sup>

There followed successive colonizations and plantations of Ireland under the reigns of various British sovereigns from Elizabeth to Cromwell. The result was the abolition of the traditional land tenure system, with the uprooting of Irish tenants from the land. Most were driven from the north and east to the west—to Connaught, the

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 78.

<sup>11</sup> "Rural Organization in Ireland," *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 53.

<sup>12</sup> Elizabeth R. Hooker, *Readjustments of Agricultural Tenure in Ireland* (Chapel Hill, 1938), 4.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

poorest province of the four which comprise Ireland.<sup>14</sup>

A succession of other British policies—penal laws, enclosure movement, ruinous tariffs on Irish industrial and agricultural exports—put more and more pressure on the land. The Great Famine and mass emigration helped to relieve the pressure by reducing the population from 6.5 million in 1841 to 4.4 million in 1861.<sup>15</sup>

Even this dubious form of relief was soon offset, however, by a series of laws, including the Ejectment Code which removed common law obstacles in the way of forfeiting estates of tenants on lease or written contract; the Civil Bill Courts Act which permitted eviction of year-to-year tenants for non-payment of rent; and, finally, the Deasy Act of 1860, which operated on the assumption that land is the exclusive property of the landlord, the tenant's interest being only that of one who has agreed to pay a certain sum for the use of the soil for a limited period. Whatever was attached to the freehold was considered part of the freehold.<sup>16</sup>

As a consequence of this series of events, the position of the Irish tenants during the 1860's declined to its lowest level in history. Rents were continually raised, evictions frequent, competition for the land severe, and agrarian unrest violent and widespread. Sean O'Faolain has sought to describe the plight of tenants during these years thus:

They did not prosper. But they held on with a tenacity that is the most moving and astonishing spectacle in the whole Irish story. For these centuries, through generation after generation, starving not by thousands but by millions, falling into the earth like the dung of cattle, weeping and cursing as they slaved, patient alike under the indifference of God and their masters, they clung to their wretched bits of land with a savage fierceness, clung as it were by their bleeding fingernails.<sup>17</sup>

Only in Ulster were tenants' rights respected, though by custom, not by law. The tenant there could retain possession as long as he paid his rent; he could sell or bequeath his interest; he could demand fair payment for his interest if the landlord ejected him; his rent was fixed periodically by professional land appraisers.<sup>18</sup>

Ultimately, however, the desperate situation of the Irish tenants inspired several attempts to relieve or remedy their distress. The first success was achieved by Prime Minister Gladstone in 1870, and marked the turning point in the British approach to the problem.

*Land Reform Laws Prior to Establishment of the Free State.* The major problems of land tenure as recognized and dealt with by Gladstone in his Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870 were: 1) Legalization of the Ulster custom; 2) Provision for compensation to tenant when he left the farm, because of improvements which he had made thereon; 3) Provision for compensation for "disturbance" to tenant if the land was arbitrarily repossessed by the landlord; 4) Conversion of tenants into owners.<sup>19</sup>

The principal objective of the Act was to improve and stabilize landlord and tenant relations. But it was precisely here that the Act failed to achieve its aim, for it failed to provide the tenant with security of tenure. Instead, it merely offered him compensation if he had to move. And even this was in part illusory since rents could be raised so high they could not be paid, and the landlord could then take the land and its improvements in forfeit, without compensation.<sup>20</sup>

These deficiencies were at first minimized during the prosperous 1870's, but the failure of crops in 1877, 1878, and 1879 resulted in the tenants being unable to pay their rents, thus causing evictions to become widespread. The Land League was formed to organize resistance to eviction and to force landlords to treat tenants fairly. The work of the League led to enactment of a new Fair Rent Act in 1881. This Act sought to ensure the fulfillment of the basic desires of the tenants—the so-called "three F's": fixed tenure; free sale of tenant's interest in his holding; and fair rents fixed by an independent tribunal.<sup>21</sup>

The Land Commission was established in accordance with the Act. Within a few years it had fixed the rents of most tenants for a period of fifteen years. The Commission subsequently reduced these rents in accordance with amendments to the Act in 1887, 1891, and 1896. In all, the Commission acted on some 371,549 cases in what is

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>15</sup> *Economic Survey of Ireland*, 77.

<sup>16</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, Appendix A, 28.

<sup>17</sup> Sean O'Faolain, *The Irish* (New York, 1949), 95.

<sup>18</sup> A. T. Murray, "Irish History of Land Ownership,"

*Foreign Agriculture*, 25; no. 9, p. 200 (September, 1951). also Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 32-33.

<sup>19</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 29.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*; also Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 40-42.

<sup>21</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 29.



now Eire. These rents later formed the basis for calculating the annual payments to be made by tenant-purchasers of such holdings under the land purchase laws.<sup>22</sup>

Dissatisfaction with the rulings of this Commission led to organized resistance by the Land League during the 1880's. It became increasingly apparent that even a real restoration of the traditional tenure would no longer be sufficient to pacify the agitated Irish tenants. Consequently, the emphasis was gradually shifted to facilitate the purchase of land by the tenants on favorable terms.

The original Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870, the subsequent Act of 1881, the Ashbourne Act of 1885, and the Balfour Acts of 1891 and 1896, were successive efforts to accomplish this end. All but the first of these Acts provided funds for the Land Commission to use either to make "advances", i.e., loans, to tenants so that they might purchase holdings directly from landlords, or to buy land itself for resale to tenants. These loans were to be repaid over a thirty-five year period, later extended to forty-nine years.<sup>23</sup> Finally, after a conference of landlord and tenant representatives, the Wyndham Act of 1903 was passed. This Act embodied the major recommendations of the unanimous report of this conference. It has been said that this law "opened a new era in Irish agrarian legislation."<sup>24</sup> The principal clauses of the Act provided:

1. A landlord must sell his entire estate, not merely individual holdings, to his various tenants, if he wished to obtain the benefits of the law;
2. The prices for holdings whose rents had been fixed by the Land Commission were set at a level providing for payment in annual installments 10-40 percent less than the rents had been;
3. The Estates Commissioners of the Land Commission could acquire estates or untenanted lands which were to be improved or added to small, uneconomic holdings and then vested in tenants or their sons, or in tenants who had been evicted from their holdings at any time since 1878 (or their heirs);
4. The Land Commission could purchase estates for resale to the tenants thereof, if 75 percent of them agreed;
5. Untenanted land could be bought by the Land Commission either to enlarge old holdings or

to create new ones in congested districts to help alleviate the special problems of those areas.<sup>25</sup>

Under the provisions of this Act, many thousands of tenants were transformed into owners through the payment of long-term "annuities", i.e., annual installments. The repayment period was set at 68.5 years, with the loan bearing 3½ percent interest. Others, who had been evicted from their tenancies earlier, were now able to return to the land as owners, not tenants. And so the pattern was set for all subsequent legislation, though there was none of importance until after the Free State was established in 1922.

By this time the emphasis was placed completely on land purchase. Security for tenants in their holdings was no longer a matter of interest or importance. The drive for complete transformation of tenants into owners was proceeding on three fronts: 1) conversion of ordinary tenants to owners; 2) relief of congestion, especially in the west; 3) reinstatement on the land of evicted tenants, and other landless groups. All told, between 1870 and 1921 some 352,457 holdings, totaling nearly eleven million acres, had been purchased at a cost of £112 million, about £110 million of which represented Government loans to purchasers.<sup>26</sup>

These improvements did not, however, lessen the desire for independence. Finally the Treaty of 1921 was signed, and in the following year the Irish Free State, made up of twenty-six counties, came into being. Northern Ireland, constituted of the remaining six counties of the northeast, refused to become part of the Free State. This partition did not interfere with the completion of the threefold program described above, though in later years some difficulties were to arise.

*Land Tenure Under the Free State and the Republic.* One of the first moves of the Free State government in the furtherance of the land tenure program already in existence was to enact the Land Act of 1925. This Act, with later amendments and modifications, has governed Irish land policy up to the present. Perhaps the main features of that policy and its achievements may be more clearly understood if we examine each of its three phases separately.

*A. Land Purchase.* Under the 1923 Land Act practically all tenanted land in the country was vested automatically in the Land Commission, to be re-vested later in tenant purchasers in fee

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-33.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 33-34.

<sup>26</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 225.

simple, subject to fixed payments over a period of years. The "annuities", or annual installments, to be paid by tenants whose rents had been fixed by the Land Commission before 1911 were set at 30-35 percent less than such rents. The annual installments to be paid by all others were either figured in accordance with rent reductions negotiated by landlord and tenant, or else were set by the Land Commission. The funds to finance these transactions were derived from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  percent Land Bonds issued by the Government, together with an outright Government contribution amounting to 10 percent of the purchase price. The purchase price averaged about fifteen times the annual rent. The payment period for the annual installments was to be 66.5 years; the interest charge was  $4\frac{3}{4}$  percent of the loan.<sup>27</sup>

The years immediately following the establishment of the Free State were characterized by grave political and social unrest, including a civil war between those who favored the free state status and those who wanted an independent republic. One result of this unrest was a marked increase in arrears of the annual installments. Consequently, in 1927 the law was amended to add compounded arrears with interest to the purchase price, to be repaid as part of new annual installments. A further modification was introduced in 1931, permitting a quicker distribution of land to tenants and leaving such details as clearance of title to be attended to later.<sup>28</sup>

At about this same time another problem relating to the "annuities" was rapidly approaching a crisis. The question was this: Should Ireland continue to transmit to Britain the annual payments forthcoming on the purchase of land under the various Acts prior to 1921? The incumbent Cosgrave government answered in the affirmative. The opposition, led by de Valera, took the contrary view. When de Valera came to power in 1932-1933, he immediately gave effect to his views. Fruitless negotiations between the Free State and Great Britain were followed by a tariff war which lasted until 1938. At that time an agreement was reached by which Eire (as it was now called under the 1937 Constitution) paid £10 million in settlement of all claims connected with the annuities, and tariffs were removed.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 105; also Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 35-36.

<sup>28</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 37.

<sup>29</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 110-111, 116.

While this controversy was raging, the question of arrears came up again. In 1933 the arrears in annuities exceeded the annual amount due that year. To relieve the situation the Land Act of 1933 was passed, forgiving all annuities more than three years past due, and funding the others with the purchase price, to be paid along with the annuities. Furthermore, all future annuity payments were cut by 50 percent though the period of payment was retained.<sup>30</sup>

Land purchases continued until shortly after the outbreak of World War II. From September, 1941 until 1946, operations of the Land Commission were sharply reduced, largely because of manpower shortages and the increased expenditures for defense and related purposes. Activity resumed after the war, and by 1948 the Land Commission was able to report that only 59,000 holdings acquired under the land acts of 1923 to 1946 remained to be turned over to tenants. Furthermore, half of these required improvement or enlargement if they were to be economically viable. In addition, 73,000 acres of untenanted land acquired before 1923, and 88,726 acres acquired since that time, remained to be disposed of. But practically all of this acreage was either bog or rocky, mountain land, virtually useless for farming.<sup>31</sup>

By March, 1950, under all the land acts from 1881 to 1946, the Land Commission had advanced money for the purchase of 447,000 holdings of 15,271,515 acres, at a total price of £128,877,048.<sup>32</sup> When it is recalled that the total agricultural land of Ireland is only some 18 million acres, and that the activities of the Land Commission after 1921 do not include Northern Ireland, it is readily apparent that a task of considerable magnitude has been performed, and that Irish farmers are virtually all owners—subject to final repayment of Government loans—of the land they till.

Not all phases of this transformation of the Irish nation from one of impoverished and oppressed tenants to one of owner-occupied farms have gone without criticism. Before considering these, however, let us turn briefly to two other issues: relief of congestion, and the return of the landless to the land.

*B. Relief of Congestion.* During the days of persecution, many tenants fled to the western parts of Ireland where the land was poorest. This led in time to severe overcrowding, a condition which

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 112-113.

<sup>31</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 6.

<sup>32</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1950, p. 8, 27.

stimulated the establishment of the Congested Districts Board under the Act of 1881. This Board had special powers to help improve the economic status of an area comprising about one-third of Ireland. Its principal activities involved promotion of agriculture and industry; public works; assistance in migration and emigration; purchase of uneconomic or scattered holdings so as to improve and enlarge them. By the time the Board was abolished by the Free State Government in 1923, it had done much to improve the economic and social status of the area, though much of its work was undone by the economic dislocations of World War I and the civil war in Ireland in the early 1920's.<sup>33</sup>

Many of the functions of the Congested Districts Board were transferred to the Land Commission by the Land Act of 1923. It provided that the Land Commission should acquire all untenanted land in congested districts and whatever untenanted land elsewhere that might be needed. This land was to be used to enlarge existing holdings or to create new ones for tenant purchase on the same terms as other land purchases. Furthermore, the cost of any needed improvements, such as drainage, fencing, repair of buildings, was to be borne in part by the purchaser.<sup>34</sup> Subsequently, the Acts of 1933 and 1936 enlarged the powers of the Commission to acquire land (compulsorily) for relief of congestion or for distribution to landless persons, even if such land was occupied by tenant purchasers of seven years standing. This last provision drew severe criticism on the ground that it undermined the tenure security so long fought for.<sup>35</sup>

More recently two general programs have been evolved to ease congestion, principally in the area known as the *Gaeltacht*, namely, Counties Donegal, Mayo, Galway, Clare, and Kerry. One is devoted to reclamation of some of the land in the area; the other deals with the migration of families from the area. The land thus reclaimed or vacated was used for enlarging small, uneconomic holdings.

"Colony Migration" was begun in 1935 to relieve congestion and to preserve and extend the use of the Irish language. A colony of Irish-speaking tenants, mostly friends and neighbors, was selected from the congested districts and settled on prepared adjacent plots in County Meath. Twenty-seven families from Galway made up the first

colony. Later, "Group Migration" of small numbers of tenants was begun from congested districts to the Midlands. By 1950, 345 families had migrated. They gave up a total area of 7,713 acres and received 9,388 acres in exchange. The cost so far has amounted to £65,300, exclusive of normal expenditures for equipping the new holdings.<sup>36</sup> The majority have migrated from Mayo to Meath. In addition, in this same *Gaeltacht* area, 591,451 acres of untenanted land have been distributed by the Land Commission since 1923, while over £3 million have been spent on improvements of various holdings.<sup>37</sup> This problem still remains one of the most difficult to resolve, and engages considerable time and attention of the Land Commission.

*C. Restoration of Evicted Tenants and Other Landless to the Land.* All the Land Acts adopted after the Wyndham Act of 1903 have empowered the Land Commission to acquire untenanted land, and in some cases owner-occupied land, in order to resell it to tenants evicted from their land during the late nineteenth century or to their heirs, as well as to certain other groups, including sons of tenants, and migrants. By March 1950, a total of 1,918,368 acres of untenanted land had been distributed to these evicted tenants and other groups referred to, at an expenditure for improvements of about £11,314,400.<sup>38</sup>

*Summary and Conclusions.* The chronicle of land tenure improvement in Ireland is one of remarkable achievement, especially in view of the many obstacles which appeared capable of deterring or preventing it. In the course of barely three-quarters of a century the Irish tenant, who had possessed no rights, who had enjoyed no security of tenure, was transformed, almost without exception, into the owner of the land he occupied. What is more, many who had been completely evicted from the land, or who had held little or no land, have been able to acquire holdings of their own. Finally, noticeable improvement has been made in the congested areas through the resettlement of tenants and the reorganization of holdings into units of more economic size. What began as a move to convert a limited number of selected tenants into owners has resulted in a mass transformation instead.

But not all aspects of this development have been greeted with unlimited approval. Exception has

<sup>36</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1943, p. 17-18; Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1950, p. 20.

<sup>37</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1950, p. 20.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-19, 31.

<sup>33</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 121-148.

<sup>34</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1948, p. 36.

<sup>35</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 112-114.

been taken to certain policies from time to time, either on social or economic grounds. For example, the first efforts to promote land purchase were criticized as alien to the ancient Irish tradition of land tenure. It was also charged that this program would lead to economic difficulties because not all tenants would be intelligent and industrious enough to be successful owners.<sup>39</sup>

Again, in the 1920's and 1930's, the decisions to forgive most of the delinquent annuities, and later to reduce the payments by one-half, were characterized as putting a premium on thrift and conscientious payment of debt.<sup>40</sup> Yet in 1945 accumulated arrears amounted to only 1.4 percent of the total collectible since 1933.

Furthermore, the provisions of the Land Acts of 1933 and 1936 were attacked as being politically inspired and executed. These Acts were designed to promote the allotment of land to the landless, even though tenant purchasers' land might be withdrawn from them if needed to achieve this end. Substantiation was lent to this charge when it was pointed out that the operation of this Act could easily wipe out the security of tenure which the successive Land Acts had sought to provide. It was further revealed that the average holding resulting from this distribution was about twenty-five acres. Forty acres was considered the economic minimum.<sup>41</sup>

One of Ireland's most eminent agricultural economists has questioned whether the whole program has not gone too far. Professor Joseph Johnston, contending that large farms should be encouraged because only they can permit efficient use of modern farm equipment, claims that "the farm-laborer on an Eastern well-run large farm has a real income in excess of the small holder's elsewhere and a degree of economic security which the latter can never hope to possess."<sup>42</sup> His criticism, of course, implies that too many of the holdings sold to tenants or provided for the landless will not survive economically.

<sup>39</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 166-168.

<sup>40</sup> Irish Land Commissioners, *Report*, 1945, p. 8.

<sup>41</sup> Hooker, *Agricultural Tenure in Ireland*, 166-168.

There is no doubt that this is a very real danger. One may agree with the view expressed by the Chairman of *Muintir na Tíre* (People of the Land) that widespread ownership of land prevents the rise of a rural proletariat and is *per se* a guarantee for farmers against the insecurity which industrial workers face,<sup>43</sup> and yet be aware that land reform and land ownership is only a prerequisite to a more efficient and prosperous agriculture.<sup>44</sup>

Despite these individual criticisms, however, there is universal agreement that the change in land tenure in Ireland is a remarkable and most desirable one. Efforts are now being directed toward more efficient use of the land. Projects such as reforestation, reclamation of bogs and marsh lands, rural electrification, turf development to provide electric power, and others—aided considerably by assistance and funds under the Marshall Plan—now command the attention of Irish agricultural experts.

The future will reveal to what extent the people of Ireland harvest the fruits of their bitter and tenacious struggle for their land. We may not all agree with O'Faolain when he says of Irish tenants of generations past: "We can only presume that this tenacity is a common phenomenon among peasants the world over. . . . I can not believe that any race has held on more bitterly than the Irish."<sup>45</sup> We can certainly agree, however, that because of their sacrifices and the enlightened efforts of many social and political leaders of both Britain and Ireland, that "today their children's children reap the reward."<sup>46</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Johnston, "An Outlook on Irish Agriculture," Part 2 *Studies*, 388.

<sup>43</sup> J. M. Hayes, "Social Security in Agriculture," *Politeia*, 3, no. 3-4, p. 247-248 (1951).

<sup>44</sup> M. J. Costello, "Farming Programme for Ireland," *Studies*, 41, no. 162, p. 129 (June, 1952). Costello is here summarizing the views of Sir Horace Plunkett, a leading figure in the Irish Cooperative movement and in the field of agricultural organization during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

<sup>45</sup> O'Faolain, *The Irish*, 95-96.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*



## SMALL FARMS AND BIG MACHINES

### COMMENT ON DR. VOLIN'S PAPER

GEROID T. ROBINSON

*Seth Low Professor of History*

*Russian Institute of Columbia University*

Among the three papers presented here today, Dr. Volin's valuable survey of a hundred years of land tenure and land reform in Russia is the only one that I had the opportunity to see and study in advance of this session. Accordingly, in opening today's discussion, I am addressing myself to Dr. Volin's paper.

I think perhaps I ought to begin by making a confession. In doing this I am honoring a current Russian practice, though I hope that in the present instance the confession will not be followed immediately by my execution.

This is the confession:

As an undergraduate in college, I dreamed of spending my life in the quiet cloisters of scholarship, very much detached from the world. I chose the history of Russia as my subject; at that time Russia seemed almost as remote as, say, Byzantium, and all the more fascinating for that.

Well, as a man who looked forward to a cloistered life, I picked the wrong subject. The choice had just been made when the Russian Revolution of 1917 tumbled me downstairs out of my ivory tower, and from that day to this, I have never felt justified in trying to climb up again.

This explains why I am glad that Dr. Volin has made a connection, in his paper, between agrarian reform in backward Russia, and agrarian reform in the backward countries to which the United States is now attempting to bring assistance.

For Dr. Volin, the kind of land reform to be desired is one that establishes and maintains a numerous class of small independent farmers. In taking this position, Dr. Volin is in excellent company. Thomas Jefferson thought that such a class of farmers would provide the strongest possible foundation for a free and democratic state. I hasten to say, before someone says it from the floor, that there are a great many differences between the independent American farmer of Jefferson's time and the independent peasant farmer that Dr. Volin

has in view. Yet I believe that both Thomas Jefferson and Dr. Volin were thinking primarily of that word "independent;" they were thinking of the small farmer, as first of all a self-directing individualist who could be counted on to resist with vigor the encroachments of outside authority.

Yet even Jefferson recognized that a certain minimum of joint action is indispensable in any society. And, just as his primary concern was to maintain the *independence of the individual*, as against all outside authority whatever, so he placed next in order of importance, I believe, the *independence of the local group*, as against all larger groupings and higher and more remote authorities. First, the autonomy of the self-directing individual; second, the autonomy of the self-directing group of neighbors. Daily practice in independent decision-making on the farm would prepare the small farmer for very effective participation in the limited amount of decision-making that must take place off the farm, particularly in the primary group organized for local self-government. Individualism supplemented by decentralized democracy—this system would be nurtured by a certain kind of man, and would give nurture to him. America's goal was not this system or any other system for its own sake, but the nurture of the self-directing individual.

Here is what Jefferson says about this kind of man, and about his relations with his neighbors and his country: "Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country, and wedded to its liberty and interests, by the most lasting bonds. As long, therefore, as they can find employment in this line, I would not convert them into mariners, artisans, or anything else."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Letter to John Jay, from Paris, August 23, 1785. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Paul Leicester Ford. (Federal Edition, 12 volumes, New York. 1904-5) 4: 449.

Since the day in 1785 when Jefferson expressed his unwillingness to see "cultivators of the earth" converted into "artisans," a great deal has happened that would have been highly distasteful to Jefferson. The industrial revolution has turned many millions of self-directing farmers, *not* simply into self-directing artisans—which Jefferson would not have liked—but into something that he would have disliked far more intensely—that is, into factory hands, machine tenders, who must work in masses and under the strictest discipline. Jefferson's reason for *disliking* this change would have corresponded closely to one of Lenin's chief reasons for *liking* it. Let us permit Lenin to explain both his own liking and Jefferson's dislike: "... it is precisely the factory..." said Lenin, "which has brought together and disciplined the proletariat... discipline and organization... are easily acquired by the proletariat precisely because of the factory 'school' through which he passes." "The proletariat is trained for organization by its whole life."<sup>2</sup>

Lenin thought that the discipline of the private factory, before the desired revolution, would prepare the workers for the much tighter discipline that would come after that revolution. Of course Jefferson did not want his small farmers to be subjected to the discipline of either of the private factory or the leviathan state.

For decades after Jefferson's time, the industrial revolution continued to draw masses of men away from the farms, but left the character of farming operations themselves largely unchanged. But more recently, machines have been swarming out of the factories into the fields, and it is a fearful fact that many of these machines are so costly and so powerful that they simply cannot be utilized by the American small farmer acting individually, and still less by the individual peasant farmers of Europe or Asia. Certainly there are many geographic areas and many types of agriculture where large-scale mechanized operations have not yet demonstrated a superior efficiency. Yet it does not seem improbable that the history of industry will tend to repeat itself in a significant degree in the history of agriculture, and that the long-term trend of technological change will under certain conditions favor the swallowing of small farms by large-scale agricultural undertakings—either capitalist or Communist.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin. *Selected Works* (International Publishers. 12 volumes. New York. n.d.) 2: 442, 439.

This is certainly not what Jefferson would have wanted; it is not what Dr. Volin wants; it is not what I want. But what is there to be done about it?

Long before the Revolution of 1917 there developed in Russia a school of thought that may give us some help just here—the school of Narodniks or Populists. This tradition moved through Chernyshevsky, Mikhailovsky, and Lavrov, with certain contributions from Tolstoy and Kropotkin, and culminated in Victor Chernov and the Socialist-Revolutionary Party (something very different, of course, from the Russian Marxist movement that culminated in Bolshevism and the Communist Party). Many of the people in the Populist tradition were as warmly humanitarian as Jefferson himself, but their emphasis was almost as much on local cooperation as Jefferson's was on individualism; they aimed, among other things, at the overthrow of the autocracy, the establishment of a moderate and decentralized socialist government, the abolition of private property in land, and the distribution and periodic redistribution of land among all those who wished to work upon it. The Russians of this school believed that under the conditions described, the communes of peasant farmers would gradually and voluntarily develop a cooperative cultivation of the soil. Of course the Populists aimed ultimately at the socialization of trade and industry also. In the Revolution of 1917, the Socialist-Revolutionaries with their emphasis on the self-governing commune, were the chief rivals of the Bolsheviks, with *their* emphasis on the authoritarian state.

Let us now try to close the circle of this discussion by returning to what was said earlier about Jefferson. Of course Jefferson's system was very far indeed from socialism—yet not so remote from decentralized Populist socialism as from the Bolshevik kind. Jefferson was deeply interested in the progress of technology. If he had lived in our own time, and had seen the fields invaded by such monsters as the grain combine and the mechanical cotton picker, what would he have done? Well, I think, he would have been the first to see that in certain regions and in the production of certain crops, large-scale operations have a technical advantage which may well go on increasing in the future. In this situation, I believe Jefferson would have said to himself that an agrarian policy that is devoted simply to the establishment of small individual farms may often be inadequate. He would have asked himself, I think, whether some

means could not be found of using the larger machines to *preserve the independence of the small farmer*, instead of allowing this farmer and his farm to be ground up and poured into the mould of large-scale enterprise. Is it not probable that Jefferson would have found the answer in some form of cooperation among neighboring small farmers: say for the purchase by each of a different type of machine and for the use of these machines on the cooperating farms in rotation, or for the joint purchase of machines and their similar rotation from farm to farm? This sort of cooperation could be strictly local, purely voluntary, and completely controlled from within by democratic procedures of the members; it could leave individual land ownership intact, and could also leave untouched in the hands of the individual farmers those operations that could best be conducted individually.

I have had the great privilege of discussing this matter with Professor Dumas Malone, whom you know so well as the eminent biographer of Jefferson. Professor Malone believes that in our age of

advancing mechanization Jefferson would have been, not hostile, but friendly to such a form of cooperation as I have described. There is no question here of sacrificing individualism to collectivism; *the objective is exactly the reverse of this*; the whole stress is on the employment of a minimum of collective effort to brace up and strengthen the small individual farm, as the soundest foundation of democracy.

Faced with the rising tide of Soviet power, and of nationalist and Communist revolution, the non-Communist countries must undertake two interlocking tasks: they must build a military screen that will deter Soviet aggression, and behind that screen they must develop healthy, vital, self-confident societies that will be immune to Communist infection. We have had considerable success with the military task, but the other undertaking is proving to be far more complex and difficult. In many regions, the success or failure of our entire cause will almost certainly turn on the success or failure of reform in both the tenure and the cultivation of the land.

## AGRICULTURAL FAIRS AND THE RISE OF HARNESS RACING

JOHN RICKARDS BETTS

*History Department, Tulane University*

Fairs were not unknown in colonial America, but it was only in the early years of the nineteenth century that the stock show developed into an important agricultural institution.<sup>1</sup> Even after Elkanah Watson held an exhibition of merino sheep in 1807 and after the Berkshire Cattle Show in 1810, fairs were held only periodically in most sections of the United States. Originating as a device by which farmers might assemble to observe and compare stock or to discuss and study new techniques, the fair was long limited to purely agricultural purposes.

As early as the 1830's horse racing was featured at a few fairs. When the Louisville Agricultural Society sponsored a fair in 1830 a race meeting was held, and it was proudly announced that "there

were persons from all parts of the United States here, and some from Europe, who spoke in praise of the racing, good order, &c."<sup>2</sup> Prior to the late 1840's, however, the farming community gave slight encouragement to the coterie of racing enthusiasts, while agricultural journals looked askance at "speed trials" as a practice foreign to the interests of farmers and repulsive to good Christians. Although John Stuart Skinner was the pioneer in discussing turf topics,<sup>3</sup> most of the available evidence points to widespread disapprobation among sponsors of fairs and among editors of agricultural journals.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *American Turf Register*, 2: 248-49.

<sup>3</sup> John Stuart Skinner, editor of the earliest important American magazine devoted to agriculture (*American Farmer*, 1819), introduced the first sports column entitled "Sporting Olio" in 1825. He had aired the argument about the value of breeding horses, had printed the news of the famous *Eclipse v. Sir Henry* match race in 1823, and had given space occasionally to subscribers' comments on racing. Later, as editor

<sup>1</sup> The story of American agricultural fairs is told in Wayne Caldwell Neely, *The Agricultural Fair* (New York, 1935). One should also consult Helen Augur, *The Book of Fairs* (New York, 1939) and Albert Lowther Demaree, *The American Agricultural Press, 1819-1860* (New York, 1941).

Showings of sheep, hogs, and other stock and demonstrations of new developments in planting, tilling, harvesting, housework, domestic arts, and agricultural machinery attracted most of the local farmers to the exhibitions of these early decades, but during the 1840's state fairs came to the fore, railroads made it possible for crowds to come from a distance, and astute promoters began to capitalize on every means of luring patrons.<sup>5</sup> The plowing match became an annual event and one of the great attractions whereby the farmer was not only able to compare the latest improvement of each manufacturer but also to test his skill against that

of his neighbor.<sup>6</sup> Along with minstrels and side shows which began to clog the midways of the larger fairs, the race course became an ever more prominent fixture in the 1850's.

Commercialization of county and state fairs increased the anxiety and the hostility of those who looked upon these annual shows as scientific, educational, and social institutions. When a race track was established in the vicinity of the Clinton County fair-grounds at Keeseville, New York, in 1842, the state agricultural society denounced the new menace as a curse, both economic and moral, which was impelling many farmers to remain at home.<sup>7</sup> Governor Henry Wise of Virginia, in a letter to the National Horse Exhibition of 1858, wrote, "Improved agriculture, and the wealth it produces, will, in my opinion, do far more for the horse than ever the turf did."<sup>8</sup> The *Working Farmer*

of the *American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine* (1829), he established the first sporting magazine and encouraged the interests of the turf in all sections of the nation. Skinner also ardently promoted agricultural societies and exhibitions, propagandized for the spread of scientific methods of farming, held several government offices, and received credit for being one of the principal promoters of agriculture in the ante-bellum era. See Harvey Worcester Smith, *A Sporting Family of the Old South* (Albany, 1936), 7-15, and files of the *American Farmer* and of the *Plough, the Loom and the Anvil* (1848).

<sup>5</sup>In such journals as the *American Farmer*, the *American Agriculturist*, the *Cultivator*, the *Plough, the Loom and the Anvil*, the *American Farmers Magazine*, and similar publications, relatively little attention was given to the turf, even in the 1850's; when responsible officials made statements they were highly skeptical of the value of thoroughbred breeding for farm work and they were critical of the evils attending the race course; the transactions of the early state societies generally ignored trotting matches. Most of the encouragement of racing came from Stuart's *American Turf Register*, William T. Porter's *Spirit of the Times* (1831), and a few other sporting publications. In 1841 in Massachusetts, for instance, it was claimed, "We have no aristocratic establishments to indulge in splendid equipages and expensive horses; and the good sense and good principles of the community and the laws growing out of them, will not, by permitting horse-racing and the gambling and profligacy to which it leads, encourage the improvement of our breed of horses by the corruption of our breed of men, nor promote even a highly desirable agricultural improvement at the expense of public morals." *Fourth Report of the Agriculture of Massachusetts. Counties of Franklin and Middlesex* (Boston, 1841), 125.

<sup>6</sup>Syracuse, New York, and New Brunswick, New Jersey, helped inaugurate statewide exhibitions in 1841. The "laudable zeal" of railroads was instrumental in the success of the Syracuse fair, while as early as 1843 a special train carried passengers from New York to a

plowing match at Paterson, New Jersey. *Cultivator*, 9: 50; *American Agriculturist*, 2: 258. By the 1850's a rapidly expanding railroad network was playing a vital role in the promotion of exhibitions. *New York Daily Tribune*, September 18, 1851; *Transactions of the Illinois State Agricultural Society*, 1, 1853-54 (Springfield, Illinois, 1855), 6; *Cultivator*, 3: 290; *Fifth Report of the Indiana State Board of Agriculture . . . For the Year 1856* (Indianapolis, 1858), 34, 482-83; *Wisconsin Farmer and Northwestern Cultivator*, 8: 509; 9: 873; 11: 386-87; *Kentucky Farmer*, 1: 12; *Springfield Weekly Illinois State Journal*, September 5, 1860. Even in Iowa the railroad catered to farmers as the newly built Mississippi and Missouri Railroad Company carried throngs to the Fairfield exhibition. *Report and Proceedings of the Iowa State Agricultural Society . . . October, 1855* (Fairfield, Iowa, 1856), 24. See also Paul Wallace Gates, *The Illinois Central Railroad and Its Colonization Work* (Cambridge, 1934), 281.

<sup>7</sup>"The annual agricultural meetings and fairs, with their plowing matches, have contributed much to bring and keep the subject of plows before the public mind." *Cultivator*, 9: 12.

<sup>8</sup>*Transactions of the New York State Agricultural Society with an Abstract of the Proceedings of the County Agricultural Societies* (Albany, 1853), 12: 375.

<sup>9</sup>*American Farmers Magazine*, 12: 629. This was not an isolated opinion for the editors of the *American Agriculturist*, A. B. Allen and R. L. Allen, stated that in matters of the turf "as a general rule, we are wholly opposed to this mode of testing the value of breeders; and if decidedly advantageous as a method of proving the requisite quality of serviceable horses, we should consider the cost in time, money and morals, far exceeding the value to be derived from it." *American Agriculturist*, 1: 79.



printed what may have been the most virulent indictment of the racing mania:

They do injustice to American farmers when they require them to give their endorsement to horse racing. . . . Fast horses are *not* an agricultural necessity nor even an agricultural product. No practical farmer need be told that the rearing and training of such horses is at utter variance with agricultural success; and no hard-working, intelligent farmer sees his son turning his attention to the development of speed in horses, especially for competition on the track, without trembling for his success as a farmer. . . . Fast horse-flesh has no practical value since the introduction of railroads and telegraphs. . . . If we cannot have Agricultural Fairs without this accompaniment, let us wait until we can.<sup>9</sup>

But the cries of protest merely reflected the rising popularity of racing in the pre-war era. Horse racing was no longer an occasional diversion of gentlemen in Charleston, Annapolis, Williamsburg, or New York.<sup>10</sup> The American turf had suffered a setback during the Embargo period of Jefferson's administration and the War of 1812, but about 1820 it began to show renewed vigor.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, 9:352.

<sup>10</sup> The story of early American racing is most thoroughly covered in John Hervey, *Racing in America, 1665-1865* (2 vols., New York, 1944), but additional insights may be found in John Allen Krout, *Annals of American Sport* (New Haven, 1929); Jennie Holliman, *American Sports, 1785-1835* (Durham, 1931); Foster Rhea Dulles, *America Learns to Play* (New York, 1940); James D. Anderson, *Making the American Thoroughbred* (Norwood, Mass., 1916); Charles R. Trevathan, *The American Thoroughbred* (New York, 1905); and other racing histories. Especially important are the files of the *Spirit of the Times* and the *American Turf Register*.

<sup>11</sup> The establishment of the Union Course on Long Island in 1821, the publicity which was showered on Eclipse through the newspapers and the *American Farmer* after his great race in 1823, and the rivalry established between northern and southern thoroughbreds contributed to this end. In 1824 the South Carolina Jockey Club published a racing code to further standardize the rules, the New York trotting Club organized in 1825, the Hunting Park Association opened in Philadelphia in 1828, the New Orleans Jockey Club appeared the same year, and in 1829 the *American Turf Register* began its popular run. By 1830 there were almost fifty known tracks, and possibly many others of lesser importance. *American Turf Register*, 2: 93; Hervey, *Racing in America*, 2: 177, 189.

Interest grew as the exploits of Eclipse, Sir Henry, Boston, Peytona, and Fashion were discussed at every barber-shop, blacksmith's forge, and country store. Huge throngs attended races during the 1830's and 1840's, and by 1850 legends of the turf had already taken form.

Popular interest centered on thoroughbred speedsters in these early decades, but by mid-century, significant signs of a rapid rise in enthusiasm for the trotting horse had appeared. A decade of abolitionism and sectional hostility, highlighted by the Kansas strife and the Dred Scott decision, discouraged the intersectional contests of the previous era. As northern industrial communities were hit by depression in 1854 and 1857, as more and more diversions appeared on the national scene, and as the people of the North and the South were increasingly alienated from one another, thoroughbred racing in Charleston and other turf centers of the South went into decline.<sup>12</sup> And, during this

<sup>12</sup> During the late forties and the fifties athletic sports such as baseball, rowing, foot racing, and cricket became much more popular, the clipper ships and the yacht *America* drew the public's attention to exploits on the seas, the German turnvereins attracted gymnasts, prize fighting was widely reported in the press, minstrel shows and circuses multiplied rapidly, and the spotlight of public interest had to be shared by devotees of the turf. That a decline in public interest did take place is shown in reports of the time. Although racing continued at many tracks and although New Orleans racing reached a peak of popularity with the prosperity of the cotton market and with the Lexington-Lecompte rivalry of the 1850's, signs of the turf's decline appeared in the 1840's. The Panic of 1837 affected racing in the South for several years. *American Turf Register*, 12: 162; *Richmond Enquirer*, September 23, 1842; Hervey, *Racing in America*, 2: 154. In the 1850's turf fans pined for "the good old days." *Porter's Spirit of the Times*, 1: 128, compared "the palmy seasons of the olden time and the present degenerate days," noting, "We have heard a great many lamentations lately on the declining spirit for the enjoyments of the turf." According to the *Nashville Daily News*, May 29, 1860, "By some means scarcely accountable, turf sports have been pining away, in the middle district of Tennessee, for several years or upwards." Blaming this on the political agitation and religious revivals of the time as well as the diversion of money to "the erection of splendid family residences and business houses," the writer complained: "The result has been, that very many of our people have forgotten that there is any such place as the Nashville Race Course." Also see *ibid.*, May 27, 1860. This decline in the North was commented on by

same interval, trotting rapidly assumed the mantle of the national pastime.

Breeding of trotters was an old established practice for many farmers who wished to fit them for carriage or saddle use.<sup>13</sup> The first trotting race reported to the press occurred in 1818, and by 1825 "trotting courses and horse clubs were firmly established in all the larger cities" of Pennsylvania, despite a prohibitory law which was later changed to legalize racing.<sup>14</sup> Oliver Wendell Holmes, recalling memories of his youth, left an enduring picture of the trotting fad of this era:

'Twas on the famous trotting-ground,  
The betting men were gathered round  
From far and near; the "cracks" were there  
Whose oaths the sporting prints declare:

.....  
Ah me! I doubt if one of you  
Has ever heard the name "Old Blue,"  
Whose fame through all this region rung  
In those old days when I was young!<sup>15</sup>

Sentiment soon developed for the trotter as a more utilitarian animal suited to the farmer's needs.<sup>16</sup> "We wish the money that is annually thrown away upon race-horses, could be devoted to the breeding of good roadsters; how much better it would be for the country, we need not add," pleaded a writer in the *American Agriculturist*.<sup>17</sup> By the early 1850's the "speed trial" was permitted at more and more fairs, often defended on the ground of scientific breeding, often endured as a gate attraction.

Trotting came to the fore both as an adjunct of and a stimulus to the agricultural exhibition. Although the early reports of county and state

editor Frank Queen in the *New York Clipper*, 5: 316, and by Henry William Herbert in *Horse and Horsemanship of the United States and British Provinces of North America* (2 vols., New York, 1857) 1: 161.

<sup>13</sup> The history of the trotter and the pacer is most completely narrated in John Hervey, *The American Trotter* (New York, 1947) and in Dwight Akers, *Drivers Up: The Story of American Harness Racing* (New York, 1938). Files of the *Kentucky Gazette* for the 1780's and 1790's give ample evidence of the breeding of trotters for farm purposes.

<sup>14</sup> Stevenson W. Fletcher, *Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life* (Harrisburg, 1950), 201.

<sup>15</sup> "How the Old Horse Won the Bet," *Atlantic Monthly*, 38: 44-48 (July, 1876).

<sup>16</sup> See the *Monthly Journal of Agriculture*, 1: 65, 71, 74; *New York Herald*, May 16, 1849.

<sup>17</sup> *American Agriculturist*, 2: 292.

societies gave little or no account of "speed trials," perhaps in deference to the scruples of many members,<sup>18</sup> records of premiums and purses crept into the annual financial reports.<sup>19</sup> If any one event was of decisive importance in the mounting popularity of harness racing at this time it was the rise to national fame of the beloved champion, Lady Suffolk. Her appearance at the Rochester fair in 1851, following a tour of the South and Midwest, was heralded as a stellar attraction for the farmers of western New York.<sup>20</sup> The well-conducted meetings of the Springfield, Massachusetts, Horse Show and the National Horse Fair gave added prestige to harness racing in the fifties.

Agricultural exhibitions sprouted up throughout the country during the fifties, and by 1858 almost all states had annual state fairs.<sup>21</sup> Flora Temple succeeded Lady Suffolk as the queen of the turf, while Hiram Woodruff gained renown as the king of drivers.<sup>22</sup> Sixty thousand spectators thronged

<sup>18</sup> Wide condemnation persisted in the agricultural press despite the support to racing of such journals or newspapers as the *Ohio Cultivator*, *New England Farmer*, and *Springfield Republican*. *Porter's Spirit of the Times*, 1: 260.

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, mention of races or of premiums in the *Fifth Report of the Indiana State Board of Agriculture... For the Year 1856*, pp. 106-107; *Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Ohio... For the Year 1856* (Columbus, 1857), 158; *Report of the Kentucky State Agricultural Society... For the Years 1856 and 1857* (Frankfort, 1857), 57; *Fourth Annual Report of the Iowa State Agricultural Society... For the Year 1857* (Des Moines, 1858); *Transactions of the Michigan State Agricultural Society... For 1856* (Lansing, 1857), 110-11; *Transactions of the California State Agricultural Society During the Year 1858* (Sacramento, 1859), 113-15; *Second Report of the Kentucky State Agricultural Society to the Legislature of Kentucky: For the Years 1858 and 1859* (Frankfort, 1860), 16. Failure to report such contests was also due to the unofficial relationship of the course and the fair, horsemen often holding meetings adjoining the fairgrounds without the sanction of the authorities.

<sup>20</sup> Lady Suffolk's tour can best be followed in the *Spirit of the Times*; her participation at Rochester is recounted in the *New York Daily Tribune*, September 19, 1851.

<sup>21</sup> *Kentucky Farmer*, 1, July, August, 1858, *passim*. Scores of trotting courses were listed for the year 1856 in Herbert, *Horse and Horsemanship*, 200, 247-57. *Wilkes' Spirit of the Times*, 1: 164, mentioned that a large number of fairs originated in 1857.

<sup>22</sup> See Akers, *Drivers Up*, 140, for Flora Temple's barnstorming tour in 1857; also see Hiram Woodruff,

the grounds of the Great Fair of the St. Louis Agricultural and Mechanical Association on a single day in 1859, a vast assemblage viewing the celebrated Flora Temple and watching the races of horses from every part of the Union.<sup>23</sup> The universality of harness racing had been established.

Popular support of fairs in the fifties stemmed from several sources. Better newspaper and magazine publicity, improved railroad networks, the encouragement and assistance of many of these companies, the softening of religious hostility to wholesome recreation, and, especially, the avid interest in new machinery and new techniques were all vitally important. Frequent testimony was given, however, to the fact that the crowd was attracted by the feverish interest in the races. While many contests were held for thoroughbreds, the predominant number of premiums and purses was allotted to trotters and pacers, demonstrating even further the interest of farmers and townfolk alike. At the United States Agricultural Society's exhibition at Boston in 1855 races were held and the *Cultivator* admitted that "the fact cannot be denied that it is this which draws such a crowd."<sup>24</sup> Much of the advance achieved by county and state societies in the promotion of annual fairs was directly due to the immense appeal of harness racing.

From the outbreak of the Civil War until the surrender of the Confederate armies, racing and all forms of recreation virtually disappeared in the South but meetings were held in numerous communities throughout the North and West.<sup>25</sup> Fairs took on renewed vigor after peace was restored,<sup>26</sup>

and harness racing became an even more integral part of the annual program. Premiums were increased,<sup>27</sup> the inauguration of the Buffalo Driving Park occurred in 1869, the National Association for the Promotion of the American Trotting Turf was formed in 1870, and the Grand Circuit officially opened in 1873. The National Grange made farmers more conscious of their mutual interests and helped in the promotion of fairs.<sup>28</sup> Founders of the Grange begrudgingly admitted that "to bring farmers out in any numbers, it is actually necessary to introduce as a prominent feature, horse races and numerous side shows."<sup>29</sup>

Dexter, Goldsmith Maid, Maud S., and Dan Patch pounded the dirt turf of tracks from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the four decades after Appomattox. Budd Doble, Ed "Pop" Geers, and John Splan were household names in rural homes; Wallace's *American Trotting Register* and other publications, including the *World Almanac*, recorded the pedigrees and running times of thousands of horses. Magazines patterned on the *Spirit of the Times* or *Turf, Field and Farm* were published in each section of the United States, while the prints of Currier & Ives and other engravers decorated the homes of thousands of Americans. Harness racing had been instrumental in the growth of exhibitions and by the end of the nineteenth century it had more than proved its importance as a permanent and colorful part of the annual program. Crowds still reacted as the humorist Josh Billings had pictured them in the late 1860's: "there was two yoke ov oxens on the ground, beside sevrul yokes ov sheep and a pile ov carrots, and some worsted work, but they didn't seem to attrakt enny sympathy. The people hanker fur pure agrikultural hoss-trots."<sup>30</sup>

*The Trotting Horse of America* (New York, 1869), and both Porter's and Wilkes' files of the *Spirit of the Times*.

<sup>23</sup> Wilkes' *Spirit of the Times*, 1: 91. States represented included Georgia, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, Maryland, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York. *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Cultivator*, 3: 370. Porter's *Spirit of the Times*, 1: 288, made a strong contention of the same nature, as did Wilkes' *Spirit of the Times*, 1: 164. See also Dulles, *America Learns to Play*, 280, and Neely, *The Agricultural Fair*, 192.

<sup>25</sup> See Wilkes' *Spirit of the Times*, vol. 11, January 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1865.

<sup>26</sup> In 1868 there were 1,367 state, county, and district fairs, at most of which the drivers competed for prizes.

*American Agriculturist for the Farm, Garden, and Household*, 30: 353-54.

<sup>27</sup> Whereas only \$935 was offered in purses at the Sacramento, California, fair in 1867, by 1872 the total reached \$3,150. *Transactions of the California State Agricultural Society During the Year 1872* (Sacramento, 1873), 725.

<sup>28</sup> Solon J. Buck, *The Granger Movement, 1870-1880* (Cambridge, 1933), 293.

<sup>29</sup> See the discussion in the *Journal of Proceedings of the Seventeenth Session of the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry . . . 1883* (Philadelphia, 1883), 24.

<sup>30</sup> Neely, *The Agricultural Fair*, 193.

## NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

### ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS

Lewis E. Atherton of the University of Missouri is the author of "Mercantile Education in the Ante-Bellum South," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 39: 623-640 (March 1953).

William D. Barns has recently compiled for the Senate Committee on Research of the West Virginia University a listing of faculty research projects in progress in five fields of the social sciences. Projects of interest to agricultural historians include: "The Diffusion of Recommended Farm Practices in Two West Virginia Counties," by Ward F. Porter, Jr.; "A History of the Grange in West Virginia," "The Populist Movement in West Virginia," "A History of Agricultural Organization in West Virginia," and "A History of Agriculture in West Virginia," by William D. Barns; and "Survey of Current Work in History of American Conservation Movement," "Idea and Policy in the American Conservation Movement," "W. J. McGee and the Idea of Conservation," and "Conservation Policies of the Two Roosevelts," by Whitney R. Cross.

Harold T. Pinkett has compiled a new aid to the student of farm labor programs entitled *Records of the Office of Labor of the War Food Administration*, published as Preliminary Inventory No. 51 by the National Archives.

Lazar Volin, regional specialist in the Department of Agriculture, discusses "Agricultural Statistics in Soviet Russia," in *Foreign Agriculture*, 17: 59-63 (March 1953).

H. L. Walster, long-time member of the Society, is retiring as Dean of the School of Agriculture at North Dakota Agricultural College on June 30, 1953. He will be succeeded by G. C. Holm of the Department of Veterinary Science. Dean Walster

will be connected with the School of Agriculture on a part-time basis and plans to devote much time to the agricultural history of North Dakota. He expects to make special studies of the development of the wheat and flax industries of North Dakota and of the contributions of the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station to the development of the flax industry.

Thomas H. LeDuc of Oberlin College, and Paul F. Sharp of Iowa State College, will teach at the University of Wisconsin this summer.

### BRITISH AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

The recently-organized British Agricultural History Society scheduled its first conference on April 13, 1953, at the Museum of English Rural Life, Reading University. Papers presented at the conference included "The Scope of Agricultural History," by James A. Scott Watson, and "The Manor in Agricultural History," by F. M. Stenton.

### EARLY BOOK ON POULTRY HUSBANDRY

The first book on poultry husbandry in English, published in 1580, has been reprinted under its original title, *The Discours Oeconomique of Prudent Choyselat* (Reading, Engl., University of Reading, 1951, 31 p., 6/6 d). Professor H. A. D. Neville of the University of Reading, in a preface, traces the history of the volume, which first appeared in France in 1569. The book was reprinted in France a number of times, and was translated into English by R.E., of whose identity there is no certain knowledge. As Professor Neville states: "While it cannot be claimed that the work is of any technical value to the modern poultry farmer, it is of considerable antiquarian interest and distinguished for the originality and erudition of the author."



5  
419  
.A2

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARITY PRICE FORMULA FOR AGRICULTURE, 1919-1923

JAMES H. SHIDELER

*University of California, Davis*

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 first wrote into law the parity formula as a precise measurement of an agricultural price goal which the Federal Government pledged itself to achieve. Parity thus became a persistent central theme in agricultural policy. The 1933 law defined parity prices as prices to farmers that "will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base period. The base period in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco shall be the pre-war period, August 1909 to July 1914."<sup>1</sup> The parity concept embraced four ideas: the right of farmers to a fair purchasing power, measurement of purchasing power by a relationship between prices of farm produce and prices of other goods, comparisons made with a base period in the past when a supposed equilibrium and stability existed, and such government intervention as was necessary to bring about a condition of "parity."

A full ten years before 1933, the parity concept was established in the farmers' consciousness. It was a product of the severe crisis which hit agriculture in 1920 and 1921, and its antecedents reach back fifty years or more before that. Fundamental to the idea of parity is the conviction of inequality in economic affairs, a grievance that was aired in the literature of agrarian protest after the Civil War. The David Lubin prize essay in 1895 measured the inequality between the status of the farmer and that of his urban fellows. The author asserted: "The farmer's interest does not lie exclusively in receiving remunerative prices for the commodities he may have to sell. His well-being is quite as much dependent upon the prices he in turn must pay for articles which either enter into the personal consumption of himself and family or are used in the process of production."<sup>2</sup>

Despite improved agricultural conditions following the depression of the Nineties, continuing thought was devoted to the unfavorable position of individualistic farmers in an economy dominated by great businesses and combinations. Even during the time of supposed equilibrium or "parity," from 1909 to 1914, there were voices complaining of agriculture's economic disadvantages. Such grievances diminished during the period of the World War when agricultural prices rose above the general level, but the first signs of postwar readjustment in 1919 found farmers and their representatives claiming attention from the government and supporting their arguments with statistics showing a reduction below "par" of the value of farm commodities. Farm journals issued in 1919 and early 1920, before the crisis, used such words and phrases as "unequal purchasing power," "under par," "disparity," and "parity." Implicit in these words was a former status of parity which had vanished, a condition that was increasingly associated with the pre-war years. Farm delegates to President Wilson's Industrial Conference in October 1919 noted that agricultural prices were on an unfair level and that "farmers, aware of the disparity which has arisen," would consciously seek "equal rights and equal treatment."<sup>3</sup>

As unsynchronized price levels squeezed the value of farm incomes even in 1919, much came to be heard from farmers about "fair" prices and the farmers' right to a price equal to the cost of production. During the war the concept of such a fair price had entered prominently into price fixing and manipulation by the Food Administration and the War Industries Board. Despite dissatisfactions with that experience, farmers became convinced that price fixing at cost-of-production levels was possible. As long as the cost-of-production formula for a fair price continued to attract the farmers'

<sup>1</sup> "In the case of tobacco, the base period shall be the postwar period, August 1919-July 1929."

<sup>2</sup> Charles F. Emerick, "An Analysis of Agricultural Discontent in the United States," *Political Science Quar-*

*terly*, 11:433-463, 601-639; 12:93-128 (Sept., Dec., 1896; March, 1897).

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the First Industrial Conference, 1919*, mimeographed, 129-132.

attention, farm organizations besieged the Department of Agriculture for investigations into costs of production, and the legislative branch was implored for laws to help stabilize prices at the cost level. Young Henry A. Wallace gave much thought to price statistics and means for gauging fair prices to farmers. His work had guided the Food Administration's Hog Price Committee in 1917 and in his interesting book, *Agricultural Prices*, published in 1920, he came close to expressing the parity concept.<sup>4</sup>

When a farm price panic began in the second half of 1920, farmers were immediately aware of an awesome gap between the prices for which they sold their crops and the prices they paid for the products of industry. Disparity in prices was powerfully symbolized by the burning of corn for fuel in the winter of 1920 and again in 1921. The *Rural New Yorker* in January, 1921, employed a similar symbol: "Do you know two men cannot carry enough hides across the street, which, when sold would buy one of them a pair of shoes? Do you know a team of horses can't haul five miles a load of hides large enough to buy them a set of harness?"<sup>5</sup> American farms had left primitive self-sufficiency far behind and the frequent purchase of daily necessities emphasized increasing differences in price levels. The idea of parity was an exchange concept which grew out of the new commercial status of farming in which relative prices had become important. Disparity became so obvious that no discussion of the farm problem could neglect it, a development that helped focus attention upon price as the heart of the farm problem. In December, 1920, the Farm Mortgage Bankers Association issued a statement which included this remark: "To illustrate the disproportionate degree of deflation to which the farmer is subjected it may be pointed out that when the farmer is asked to take 30 cents for his corn . . . he should be able to buy other commodities, if deflated in like ratio, at prices far below present levels."<sup>6</sup>

Rough measurements of the amount of disparity could be found in statistical time series published by the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the American Statistical Associa-

tion, Bradstreet, Dun, and many other public and private agencies. The course of variant price levels during the war hastened a growth of interest in price indexes, a statistical device which was about 200 years old but which did not emerge from infancy until shortly before the World War period.<sup>7</sup> Henry A. Wallace wrote in May, 1921: "We want to construct a new index number, an index number reflecting . . . the price level on which the Iowa farmer sells his product. Also we wish another index number reflecting the price level of the products which the farmer buys. . . . After taking into account not only the prices at which the farmer sells but also the size of the crops we find that . . . the Iowa farmers' index number is about 104 per cent of the pre-war normal. . . . In calculating the index number of the things which the Iowa farmer buys we find that it stands roughly at 177 per cent of pre-war normal."<sup>8</sup> It was becoming clear that the farmers' vague sense of economic inequality had a basis of fact in the economists' price series and index numbers; furthermore, the inequality of prices could be determined with some precision. The parity idea, then, was a sounder measurement of the farmers' misfortunes than the disputable cost-of-production formula, and it was to be expected that farm relief suggestions would define fair price objectives as parity prices.

The Department of Agriculture under the new leadership of Secretary Henry C. Wallace devoted vigorous attention to statistics of the agricultural industry. Before he entered upon his new duties, the elder Wallace had asserted that it was the purpose of the Department to help farmers market their products at "fair prices" and fair prices were relative: "Farm products must go up in price," he said, "and other products must come down, until the normal relation between them is restored and

<sup>7</sup> Irving Fisher, *The Making of Index Numbers* (Boston, 1922), 460; John D. Black and B. D. Mudgett, *Research in Agricultural Index Numbers, Scope and Method*, Social Science Research Council, *Bulletin* 10, 4-5. The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics began publication of a monthly index number of wholesale prices of 250 to 260 commodities in 1902. The Department of Agriculture had begun to study farm purchasing power in 1910 and in its 1918 *Yearbook* the Department first published a table showing the purchasing power of one acre of crop production as well as tables of index numbers of crop prices and values. U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1918, 694-695, 701.

<sup>8</sup> *Wallace's Farmer*, May 27, 1921, p. 4. His ratio would have been 58.

<sup>4</sup> Henry A. Wallace, *Agricultural Prices* (Des Moines, 1920), 28, 52-56.

<sup>5</sup> *Rural New Yorker*, 80:46 (Jan. 8, 1921).

<sup>6</sup> Senate and House Joint Committees on Agriculture, *War Finance Corporation Renewal, Hearings . . . 66th Cong. 3d sess.*, (1920), 11.

they meet on a price level preferably about 70 per cent above the normal before the war."<sup>9</sup> Holding that the law of supply and demand was irrevocable, Wallace was opposed to "freak legislation" for price stabilization and proposed that the farmers put themselves on a business-like basis: "We must adjust our various crops to the probable needs." In the agricultural policies of the elder Wallace production adjustment loomed large as a means of achieving price parity for agriculture.

Under Henry C. Wallace the Department of Agriculture became a training station for a whole new generation of agricultural economists who dominated the field from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, created in 1922, and directed attention to the statistical bases of farm prices and income. With Department of Agriculture assistance, the evolution of a detailed parity formula proceeded rapidly during the crisis years 1921-23. At first a simple relationship was established between a market price index for farm products and the all-commodity wholesale price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The statistical relationship between farm prices and prices of manufactured goods was subject to endless experimentation, refinement, and modification according to the statistician's bias. Experiments on the farm side of the ratio used prices at the farm and weighted production volume. On the other side, food prices were subtracted from wholesale prices, retail prices were substituted for wholesale, and prices were weighted by the quantity of goods purchased by farmers. The Department of Agriculture's early indexes of farm purchasing power were rough and inaccurate by later standards; techniques of formulating such indexes had not yet been standardized among the statisticians who engaged in continuing discussion looking toward a generally acceptable formula. The period August, 1909, to July, 1914, became the most commonly accepted parity base period, since monthly data on prices paid to farmers were not available before 1909, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics index of all commodities used that base. That was the most recent period before the wartime dislocations, most farm product prices were thought to be in favorable relation to other prices, and there was unusual price stability during that time. No one year could be

generally suitable as a base period because of variations in volume of production.<sup>10</sup>

In 1921 the Department produced a set of index figures showing the purchasing power of farm products in relation to the year 1914. The average purchasing power of one acre of crops in 1921 was shown to be 52 per cent of 1914, the base year.<sup>11</sup> Not until 1922 did the U. S. Department of Agriculture begin regularly to publish information on current price ratios. Increases in farm prices in 1922 were offset by increased prices of goods farmers bought, and the Department was interested in revealing the facts of the price situation as the basis for voluntary production adjustments. In March, 1922, *Weather, Crops and Markets* published a table showing the prices of articles bought by farmers and the purchasing power of one acre of crops. Two weeks later, this serial used a table showing the relative purchasing power of all farm products; 1913 was the base year, and farm prices were balanced against the Bureau of Labor Statistics index from which food and farm products were deleted.<sup>12</sup>

Unsettled procedures for framing indexes of agricultural price conditions led to disagreements. In the spring of 1923 the U. S. Department of Agriculture index showed the farmer's dollar to be worth 69 cents while that of the Department of Commerce index stood at 102, a wide difference which illustrated divergent attitudes toward the farm problem and intensified a long-standing discord between Secretary H. C. Wallace and Secretary H. C. Hoover.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See H. R. Tolley, "Agriculture and the Parity Yardstick," address before the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, November 11, 1941, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, mimeographed, 2.

<sup>10</sup> U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1921, p. 783. A table on page 787 showed crop and livestock prices to be 110 per cent of 1909-13, while the prices of articles farmers bought was 181 per cent. That would be a parity level of 60. See also C. R. Ball, C. E. Leighty, O. C. Stine, and O. E. Baker, "Wheat Production and Marketing," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1921, p. 147-198, for graphs showing the purchasing power of wheat in terms of the 1913 dollar.

<sup>11</sup> U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Weather, Crops and Markets*, 1:188, 243 (March 4, 18, 1922). See also *ibid.*, 1:441, 445 (May 27, 1922); U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, *The Agricultural Situation*, July, 1922, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup> See William Johnson, "Figures Do Lie, The De-

<sup>9</sup> Iowa, *Yearbook of Agriculture*, 1920, p. 580. See also U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Weekly News Letter*, March 16, 1921.

One outstanding product of the Agriculture Department's statistical interest was the publication in 1921 of information which Professor G. F. Warren of Cornell had been circulating and refining since 1918, now further expanded in the Department of Agriculture Bulletin 999, *Prices of Farm Products in the United States*. This pioneer bulletin brought together and placed on a statistical foundation the popular ideas concerning agriculture's price disparity. Farm journals seized upon Warren's bulletin as evidence that previous assumptions were valid and used it as a text for innumerable editorials and articles. Professor Warren made it abundantly clear that "practically nothing that the farmer sells can be exchanged for the usual quantity of other things. It is physically impossible for farmers to absorb the products of factories."<sup>14</sup> In June, 1921, Warren found the weighted average purchasing power of 31 farm products at prices paid to farmers to be 70 per cent of the five-year average, August, 1909, to July, 1914.<sup>15</sup> Going beyond a mere examination of prices, Warren suggested measures for their improvement that involved substantial guidance of agricultural affairs by political institutions. He proposed, for one thing, that the export of agricultural surpluses be aided by public financing of European purchasers, and he suggested that the nation adopt a policy of agricultural self-sufficiency with the eventual adjustment of production to the domestic market.

During the summer and autumn of 1921 a Congressional Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry examined the unfavorable agricultural situation in detail. The Congress directed the Commission, among other things, to investigate "the relation of prices of commodities other than agricultural products to such products," and the Commission undertook to measure the well-being of the farmer by four standards, the first of which was: "The purchasing power of the farmer's

dollar."<sup>16</sup> The Commission accumulated altogether seven volumes of material. Outstanding in that evidence was the fact of price disparity. A procession of witnesses testified pathetically that crop prices were distressfully low in relation to the prices of other goods.<sup>17</sup> A Kansas farmer testified: "We have got to find out some way whereby we will establish a ratio of something reasonable between the things that the farmer has to buy and the things that he has to sell. You have got the farmer to a prewar basis in what he has to sell, but he is buying his supplies on the highest war basis. There must be some regulation between those conditions."<sup>18</sup>

In its report the Commission relied upon tables of index figures showing prices and purchasing power, using two base periods, 1909-1914 and the year 1913. The report also set forth the view: "The orderly development of production, marketing and distribution of farm products must be predicated upon the establishment of price levels representing a fair degree of equality of purchasing power between agricultural products and other commodities. . . . It is perfectly obvious that agriculture can not prosper on the basis of a price level for its products substantially below the price level of other commodities."<sup>19</sup>

The Joint Commission's report disregarded the necessity for strong measures and chose to recommend such palliatives as new credit facilities, freight rate revision, and marketing reforms—small measures which sprang from a misinterpretation of the causes of the farm problem. Favorable price readjustment, the report said, "can not be brought about by legislative formulas but must be the result for the most part of the interplay of economic forces." However, the report continued, "the government . . . should do . . . what it may be possible to do, based upon sound principles, to facilitate this readjustment."<sup>20</sup>

partment of Agriculture's Gloomy Outpourings are Sharply Challenged," *Wallaces' Farmer*, May 11, 1923, p. 10; G. F. Warren and F. A. Pearson, *The Agricultural Situation* (New York, 1924), 233.

<sup>14</sup> G. F. Warren, *Prices of Farm Products in the United States*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin 999, p. 19.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 65. Warren's bulletin was the first to use prices paid to farmers but they were balanced against the Bureau of Labor Statistics' index of wholesale prices of all commodities. *Ibid.*, 56.

<sup>16</sup> U. S. Congress, Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, *Report*, 67th Cong., 1st sess., H. R. Doc., 408, 4 parts, (1921), 1:9, 13.

<sup>17</sup> Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, *Hearings* . . . 67th Cong., 1st sess., 3 vols. (1922). T. C. Atkeson of the Grange presented at the Commission's hearings a chart showing the relative position of farm product prices based on the five-year pre-war normal from 1910 to 1914. *Ibid.*, 3:348-349.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:164.

<sup>19</sup> *Report*, 1:24, 27.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.



Even the meager proposals of the Joint Commission, however, were in advance of the farm policy of the Harding Administration which regarded the slump as an unavoidable aftermath of war. President Harding told Congress the government could not help more than it was and "the only sure way to normalcy is over the paths nature has marked throughout all human experience."<sup>21</sup> But for farmers, "parity" rather than "normalcy" became the by-word. By the end of 1921 the parity formula, with certain refinements reserved for the future, had become established except for the implication that conditions of parity should be created by aggressive government intervention. Price index numbers and purchasing power ratios were developed as tools of economists for understanding price relationships. Parity, however, was taken out of the statisticians' laboratories and applied by agrarians as a goal for political farm relief. As applied, parity became an unscientific expedient growing out of a bad price situation and agrarian self-consciousness.

If the Joint Commission and the Administration were short on means to achieve equality for agriculture in the price world, there was no lack of drastic schemes for giving justice to the farmers. Outright government price fixing was proposed without consideration for any surplus problems. At the other extreme was cooperative marketing which became a panacea as visionary national marketing agencies were projected which would be able to fix commodity prices in a monopolistic fashion. Not only did price-fixing and stabilization schemes suffer from economic naïveté, they aroused little response because the agricultural depression was still young. It was regarded as a maladjustment that would cure itself in time. Time, however, dispelled false optimism and weakened resistance to ideas of large-scale interference in economic affairs by government.

It came to be seen that the old remedies were no longer adequate. Gray Silver, legislative representative of the American Farm Bureau, came before the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry with a significant statement: "We are sick. We are sick nigh unto death. We come here to the great healer, and we are . . . asking you that an instrument of relief be given."<sup>22</sup> Secretary Wallace

accumulated a file of the most pathetic letters he had received from farmers pleading for relief, copies of which he sent to President Harding. By January, 1922, it was possible for a responsible public officer, Governor Kendall of Iowa, to ask for the use of interest payments on the war debt to subsidize the export of surplus crops and to declare to the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation: "We have got to have a market, and right away, unless we expect to see disaster more acute than it has been up to this time. Paternalism? Yes, it is paternalism . . . but these are not ordinary times."<sup>23</sup> And finally, the winter crisis of 1921-22 prompted a flood of memorials to the Congress requesting one or another agency to stabilize prices in relation to prices farmers had to pay.

A business and industrial depression had joined the crisis in agriculture, and it seemed clear that the farmers' lack of purchasing power was vastly complicating the business side of the economy. In October, 1921, the President's Unemployment Conference heard from its agricultural delegates that the trouble with the country was the low purchasing power of farmers and that "all prices and all wages should be so adjusted that a normal reasonable ratio will be established between the incomes of farmers, laborers, manufacturers and the merchants in order that the purchasing power of the farmer may be restored."<sup>24</sup>

In November, 1921, Secretary Wallace in his *Annual Report* made a doleful estimate of the farm situation: "The purchasing power of the principal farm crops of the year 1921 at the present time is lower than ever before known. . . . Probably never have our farmers generally been compelled to exchange their crops per sale unit for such small amounts of the things they need. The purchasing power of our major grain crops is little more than half what it was on an average for the five prewar years of 1910-1914, inclusive."<sup>25</sup>

Then, as the agricultural crisis obviously harmed the business of supplying goods to farm consumers, especially the farm machinery industry, two officials of the New Moline Plow Company produced a program for solution of the farm problem.

<sup>21</sup> Iowa, *Yearbook*, 1921, p. 399.

<sup>22</sup> Report of the Committee on Agriculture to the President's Conference on Unemployment, mimeographed copy in Legislative Records Division, National Archives.

<sup>23</sup> U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1921, p. 6-7.

<sup>24</sup> *Congressional Record*, 67th Cong., 1st sess., July 12, 1921, p. 3597.

<sup>25</sup> Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, *Hearings*, 1:340.

Former members of the War Industries Board George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson made a major contribution by re-stating the parity ideal and proposing an ingenious mechanism for price stabilization. In the Peek-Johnson plan the ideal of parity or "a fair exchange value for any crop" was "one which bears the same ratio to [the] current general price index as a ten-year, pre-war, average crop price bore to [the] average general price index for the same period."<sup>26</sup> This goal was to be achieved by the subsidized export of surplus commodities that could not be sold behind tariff protection for prices at the parity level. A public export corporation was to manage the disposal of surpluses which would be subsidized through the collection of an "equalization fee" charged against those goods which enjoyed augmented prices through this machinery. To George N. Peek, his surplus disposal mechanism was more interesting than the price formula, and he did not get away from a cost-of-production standard until about a year after he developed his plan. In the second edition of *Equality*, "fair exchange value" was regarded as synonymous with "cost of production plus a profit."<sup>27</sup>

The unique contribution of Peek and Johnson was not so much their ability to invent at once a plan for farm relief as it was their determination to pound their idea persistently into popular attention and diminish opposition to political price management. The parity formula carried with it a certain mysticism and hocus-pocus combined with a loose sense of elemental justice which made it immensely attractive to distressed farmers and their sympathizers. In October, 1921, the Peek-Johnson plan was presented to leaders of the American Farm Bureau who gave encouragement, but that group was committed to cooperative marketing and fearful of bureaucratic interference in agricultural affairs. Then the plan was published as an unsigned pamphlet with the title, *Equality for Agriculture*.

Page proof of the pamphlet was sent to Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover in January, 1922, for comment. Hoover had been aware of the relatively

poor price position of agriculture since the agricultural crisis had first begun, and he had moved prominently into the field of agricultural reform leadership.<sup>28</sup> At this time Hoover was interested in the promotion of foreign trade in agricultural products which involved him in a conflict with Henry C. Wallace's Department of Agriculture. He was also developing the idea of farm relief by efficiency in marketing to be brought about by the farmers themselves through great marketing associations under the supervision and guidance of the federal government. Both goals were to find expression in Hoover's Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929. In testimony before the I.C.C. in February, 1922, Hoover said: "The real remedy is an attack on the causes of the [marketing] spread and through solution of the causes thereby bring consumer's goods down to the producer's buying power."<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, Hoover was repelled by any such manipulation of prices as was projected in *Equality for Agriculture*.

Seeking advice from his staff, Hoover was told: "There is no way of compiling a general price index number that would be sufficiently accurate for fixing the price level of agricultural products."<sup>30</sup> Hugh Johnson, receiving no reply from the Secretary of Commerce, wrote: "It seems to me that the subject ought not cavalierly to be dismissed. Indeed, I have learned enough in the past four weeks to know that it cannot be dismissed at all."<sup>31</sup>

In January, 1922, a National Agricultural Conference met at the call of Secretary Wallace with President Harding's approval. Peek and Johnson who attended the conference lost no opportunities to spread their gospel. The parity price formula as a goal for price stabilization was still very new, but its superiority to the cost-of-production formula

<sup>28</sup> Herbert C. Hoover, "Farmers' Problems," address before the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, October 14, 1920, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, *22d Biennial Report*, 3-18. In a letter to Senator Capper in June, 1921, Hoover had written: "Certainly these levels must come into step or the agricultural industry and its standards of living will be undermined." *Successful Farming*, June 1921, p. 8.

<sup>29</sup> Herbert Hoover, *Economic Factors in Railway Rate Adjustment* (Washington, 1922), 7. See also Secretary of Commerce, *Tenth Annual Report*, 1922, p. 28.

<sup>30</sup> L. Domeratzky memorandum to Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, Feb. 1, 1922, Hoover Archive, Stanford, Cal.

<sup>31</sup> Hugh S. Johnson to Herbert Hoover, Feb. 23, 1922, Hoover Archive.

<sup>26</sup> [George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson] *Equality for Agriculture* (1st ed., Moline, Ill., 1922), 22. Peek had found his statistical bearings in G. F. Warren's *Bulletin* 999. John D. Black, *Parity, Parity, Parity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 46.

<sup>27</sup> Peek, *Equality for Agriculture* (2d ed., Moline, 1922), 12.

was clear enough to start a rush to this new principle. The conference chairman, Representative Sydney Anderson, said nothing new when he told the conference that "as compared with 1913, the farmer's dollar in May . . . in terms of all commodities was worth 63 cents."<sup>32</sup> More than any other single theme, disparity dominated discussion of the farm crisis. Nevertheless, the Conference was not willing to approve any radical scheme for price fixing or comprehensive remedy for the farm problem.

A committee on price relations returned to the National Agricultural Conference a report devoted to elaboration of the farmer's poor purchasing power: "The conference declares that no revival of American business is possible until the farmer's dollar is restored to its normal purchasing power." The same committee submitted a resolution which was adopted: "... this conference recommends that every instrumentality of the Government of the United States be exercised to put the agricultural industry on a par with other industries both as to remuneration, education, and general standard of living."<sup>33</sup> Another committee reported that it was "the sense of this committee that the Congress and the President of the United States should take such steps as will immediately re-establish a fair exchange value for all farm products with that of all other commodities."<sup>34</sup> Traditional ideas of the proper price-making forces were clearly being challenged.

Following the National Agricultural Conference, Peek and Johnson remained in Washington to promote their ideas, especially in the Department of Agriculture and with President Harding. Secretary Wallace shared the conservative antagonism to political price manipulation and continued to rely heavily upon agricultural improvement resulting from the adjustment of crop acreage as statistical information on crops and markets was supplied by the Department. After giving Peek and Johnson a hearing, Wallace was impressed with the promises of their plan, and put the Department at their service in developing statistical data.<sup>35</sup> Wallace also helped arrange for the presentation of Peek's plan before a select group of

agricultural and business leaders at the Department of Agriculture on February 13, 1922. At this meeting, Julius Barnes criticized the ratio price as one that would not operate fairly in all sections of agriculture.<sup>36</sup> Wallace did not accept the plan, but neither did he forget it. His response to the plan was not quite as Hugh Johnson later stated it: "We took it to Washington . . . and sold it lock, stock, and barrel to the elder Wallace."<sup>37</sup>

For a year after the National Agricultural Conference, while Peek and Johnson were seeking converts to their cause, Secretary Wallace observed the failure of agriculture to recover an equal position in the economy. The beginning of an industrial boom refuted the farmers' cherished belief that their well-being was essential to a prosperous economy but it did intensify the demands of farmers for relief. When his Agricultural Outlook Conference in the spring of 1923 recommended that farmers adjust to the depression by getting out of farming and moving to the city, Secretary Wallace believed that the nation's agricultural foundation was being impaired. A Department of Agriculture serial, *The Agricultural Situation*, on August 1, 1923, noted that "the most general and deadly handicap is that disparity which persists between prices of things that farmers have to sell and those they must buy. That matter is still the very root of such agricultural disturbance as exists." Wallace observed that farmers refused to adjust their production and continued to pile up surpluses despite information from the Department of Agriculture. He was also concerned about the lack of sympathy for agriculture within the official family of President Harding, and when Harding was succeeded by Calvin Coolidge who looked to Herbert Hoover for advice on agricultural policy, Wallace concluded

<sup>32</sup> Conference called by Secretary Wallace, . . . February 13, 1922 . . . to consider means of reestablishing a fair ratio of exchange between farm products and other products, typewritten stenographic report, 92 p. Records of the Department of Agriculture, Files of the Secretary, National Archives. See also John D. Black, *Agricultural Reform in the United States* (New York, 1929), 233; John D. Black, "The McNary-Haugen Movement," *American Economic Review*, 18:405-427, Sept., 1928; Russell Lord, *The Wallaces of Iowa* (Boston, 1947), 240.

<sup>37</sup> Hugh S. Johnson, *The Blue Eagle from Egg to Earth* (Garden City, N. Y., 1935), 105.

<sup>33</sup> National Agricultural Conference, *Report*, 67th Cong., 2d sess., H. R. Doc. 195, (1922), p. 20.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 137, 139.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 171. See also 153-154.

<sup>36</sup> U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Agricultural Prices Compared* [1922].

that both he and the farmers were being "shoved off the end of the bench."

By the early autumn of 1923 Secretary Wallace had joined the leadership of a Wallace-Peek plan movement. Wallace attempted to get consideration for the plan in the Cabinet and failing that, he publicly promoted the plan, notably in a Department study published as *The Wheat Situation* and in his *Annual Report* to the President, both widely distributed.<sup>38</sup> In *The Wheat Situation*, Wallace wrote: "Since the immediate difficulty in the present situation is the maladjustment in price ratios, what is most needed right now is some way to restore the proper ratios." In his *Annual Report* of November 15, 1923, Wallace said the objective of the plan was "to secure for wheat and other agricultural products an exchange value approximately equal to what it was before the war . . . The end sought, therefore, is to put farm products on a price plane comparable with the price plane of other commodities."<sup>39</sup>

By this time, official thought in Washington was coming to accept the idea that price as determined by supply and demand might fail to be a healthy price and that action should be taken to stabilize farm purchasing power.<sup>40</sup> Even President Coolidge in his message to Congress on December 6, 1923, admitted that "with his [the farmer's] products not selling on a parity with the products of industry, every sound remedy that can be devised should be applied for the relief of the farmer."<sup>41</sup> However, the President indicated he would oppose unsound, expensive remedies.

Wallace put Charles J. Brand of the Department's staff to work drafting a bill which would include the principles of the Wallace-Peek plan. Brand sought the collaboration of Peek and Johnson and advice from others, and in January, 1924, Senator Charles McNary and Representative Gilbert N. Haugen introduced the bill in their respective houses. Under this bill, an export commission was to establish for certain crops a

ratio price which "shall bear the same relation to the current all-commodities price . . . as . . . the pre-war . . . price bears to the pre-war all-commodities price."<sup>42</sup> The McNary-Haugen bill quickly received the support of most major farm organizations and became agriculture's predominant legislative interest for the next four years. The magic of parity plus a plausible scheme of surplus disposal was enticing. Parity prices would be much above prevailing prices; no other scheme was equally specific or so apparently reasonable.

The McNary-Haugen bill aroused antagonism from several quarters among the farmers, with the surplus disposal mechanism more under attack than the parity formula. The Farmers' National Council in a press release on January 23, 1924, denounced Secretary Wallace as blocking real farm relief by promoting the McNary-Haugen plan and said: "Wallace ignores the fundamental principle that farmers must get costs of production plus a reasonable profit and substitutes a differential calculus fourth dimension mathematics scheme to determine what price farmers are to be paid for their products."<sup>43</sup>

The battle for the successive McNary-Haugen bills dominated agricultural politics until the Administration of President Hoover made an effort to do the same things in a different way through the Farm Board, created just in time to have the Great Depression make its task an impossible one. The agrarian demand for government action to bring about parity prices was made more insistent by new adversities, and no administration would have been allowed to survive which did not give convincing proof of its good intentions toward the farmers. The government action requested was regimented price stabilization on the parity formula that would provide security for a minority industry in a consolidated economic world.

<sup>42</sup> House Committee on Agriculture, *McNary-Haugen Export Bill; Hearings*... 68th Cong., 1st sess. (1923), p. 1. "For the purposes of the bill, the period 1905-1914 has been selected as a representative pre-war period during which the purchasing power of farm commodities, as compared with other commodities, was fair to the farmer." Senate Report 410, 68th Cong., 1st sess. (1924), 4.

<sup>43</sup> Records of the Department of Agriculture, Files of the Secretary, National Archives.

<sup>38</sup> Both were published as separates and in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook*, 1923.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 17, 149.

<sup>40</sup> H. C. Taylor, *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932* (Ames, Iowa, 1952), 599-600.

<sup>41</sup> *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., 100.



## GRASSHOPPERS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

JOHN T. SCHIEBECKER

*University of Wisconsin*

And they covered the whole face of the earth, wasting all things. And the grass of the earth was devoured, and what fruits soever were on the trees . . . , and there remained not anything that was green on the trees, or in the herbs of the earth in all Egypt. *Exodus*, 10:15.

As historians have explored the question of how the frontier exercised a new and definite influence on the settler, such things as the Indian menace, isolation, floods, prairie fires, droughts, and hurricanes have been considered and techniques for meeting these challenges of the wilderness have been carefully investigated. Even the animal elements of the frontier have received attention. The beaver, the buffalo, the longhorn steer, and Missouri mule have all had their day. Collectively or individually, these elements of the environment helped shape the course of history, and they deserve the attention which has been accorded them. But the lowly, despicable grasshopper has generally been ignored. Occasionally some plague has received isolated consideration, but no attention has been given to the constant, persistent influence of the destructive insect.

The significance of the grasshopper was not restricted to the frontier, however, for every year witnessed depredations of some sort in almost every region of the nation. Thus a full consideration of the problem must include accounts of all the agricultural areas throughout all periods. The problem is obviously too vast to be handled in a brief paper, but the importance of the insect can be suggested.

There are several hundred species of grasshoppers which damage crops. These fall roughly into two groups, the migratory and the nonmigratory. Within these groups there are, of course, certain individual differences, but it is possible to outline some qualities that apply to all.

On the whole, they seem to prefer cultivated to wild plants, and when present in large numbers, will eat a crop entirely. On occasion they have been known to eat the bulbs of onions, leaving the field pock-marked with holes and, as oldtimers asserted, wafting the odor of onions in the air as they flew

away.<sup>1</sup> When only a few grasshoppers were present, they concentrated on the tenderest part of the plant, chewing off heads of young wheat, destroying corn silk, and eating through the stem that supports the cotton boll. Thus only a few of the insects could ruin a crop without completely devouring it.<sup>2</sup>

The amazing reproductive powers of the grasshoppers contribute to their destructiveness. The eggs are deposited in tunnels in the soil in pods containing from 15 to 20 eggs. The number of pods varies according to species and weather conditions; in a good grasshopper year the female may deposit up to 200 eggs. These hatch throughout the season, giving a supply of pests from spring until fall. In the winter, the eggs lie dormant and hatch as the air temperature reaches 75 or 80 degrees. The young grasshoppers emerge with ravenous appetites as miniature editions of the adult. The insects molt about 5 or 6 times altogether, but are incapable of flight until the final instar. Thus, while immature they are unable to escape capture on the ground. The destructive propensities of the grasshopper remain the same, however, regardless of their stage of development. Warm, dry weather is most favorable to their increase, and great plagues are generally associated with drought. Several species have long and dishonorable records of destruction, but any species is dangerous under favorable conditions.<sup>3</sup>

This last fact has given the division between migratory and nonmigratory species historical as well as entomological significance. As a rule, the migratory species have been the special bane of the frontier; the local species have attacked the settled areas. Why these two general groups should behave in this manner is not altogether clear. However, it has been observed that the migratory grass-

<sup>1</sup> Everett Dick, *The Sod-House Frontier, 1854-1890* (New York, 1937), 205.

<sup>2</sup> J. R. Parker, "Grasshoppers and Their Control," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Farmers' Bulletin* 1828 (Washington, 1939), 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 7-11.

hoppers seldom deposit eggs in cultivated fields. Thus, as an area became largely cultivated, the migratory insects moved farther westward to find new breeding grounds. Large scale destruction by local species was seldom recorded until after serious damage by migratory grasshoppers was fairly well ended. In fact, both entomologists and farmers were inclined to assume a contemptuous attitude toward the "harmless" local species, but the plagues of 1936 and 1939 shattered that particular illusion.<sup>4</sup>

The history of the migratory species very nearly coincides with that of the frontier. The activities of the insect, however, are recorded even earlier in Indian legends of North and South America. There are grasshoppers pictured on potsherds, and the earliest accounts of white men reveal the frequency of locust invasions.<sup>5</sup> In colonial America, the frontier area of Maine was one of the first regions to suffer attack. "In 1749 and 1754 they were very numerous and voracious; no vegetable escaped these greedy troops; they even devoured the potato tops; and in 1743 and 1756 they covered the whole country and threatened to devour everything green."<sup>6</sup>

Grasshopper plagues occurred in Vermont in 1797 and 1798. It was reported that the insects ate the clothes which workers in the fields had taken off and put to one side. In the Far West, grasshoppers swarmed over the Jesuit missions of California from 1746 to 1749, and reappeared in 1753, 1754, 1765, 1766, and 1767. The precise extent of the damage was not recorded for these earlier visitations, but it must have been considerable. Plagues of serious proportions were reported in Minnesota and Missouri in 1818 and 1819. The California missions suffered in 1823 and again in

1827 or 1828. The last invasion caused a near famine throughout most of the area.<sup>7</sup>

Because of the slowness in settling, and sparseness of population, the Great Plains in particular were subjected to widespread devastation with depressing regularity from 1830 to 1878. In 1855, Alexander Taylor of the Smithsonian Institution stated: "The records prove that the locusts extended themselves, in one year, over a surface comprised within thirty-eight degrees of latitude, and in the broadest part, eighteen degrees of longitude."<sup>8</sup> Half the crops of Utah were destroyed, and damage was severe in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas. Crops were completely destroyed at Little Falls and Elk River in Minnesota in 1856. The accounts vary by time and place, but the pattern is generally the same. The grasshoppers came in clouds which darkened the sky, they struck buildings like hail, and from the fields came the munching sound of thousands of insect jaws.<sup>9</sup> Clothing on lines was devoured, trains were unable to move on the tracks, tents of pioneers had holes gnawed in them, and branches of small trees were broken by the weight of insects clustered on them. Turkeys and other fowl stood and looked, and then ate until they could eat no more. People were tormented by the pests and in one instance a soldier, sleeping in the sun, was bitten until he bled around wrists and neck.<sup>10</sup>

When the grasshoppers had left, the scene was one of complete devastation.

One has no idea of the magnitude or destructibility of this plague. Flying in clouds so thick as to darken the

<sup>4</sup> W. R. Walton, "Grasshopper Control," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Farmers' Bulletin* 747 (Washington, 1916), 13; F. L. Washburn, "Modern Warfare Against Grasshoppers," *Popular Science Monthly*, 81:465 (November, 1912); George D. Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri," Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, *Bulletin* 406 (Columbia, 1939), 2; J. A. Munro, "Grasshoppers and Agricultural Development in North Dakota," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 29:815 (October, 1936).

<sup>5</sup> Walton, "Grasshopper Control," 13; A. S. Taylor, "Grasshoppers and Locusts of America," *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institute of the Year 1858* (Washington, 1859), 203.

<sup>6</sup> Thaddeus W. Harris, *A Treatise on some of the Insects Injurious to Vegetation*, ed. by Charles Flint (Boston, 1862), 169.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 170; Taylor, "Grasshoppers of America," 203, 209; Charles V. Riley, "Destructive Locusts," U. S. Division of Entomology, *Bulletin No. 25* (Washington, 1891), 10; Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri."

<sup>8</sup> Taylor, "Grasshoppers of America," 201.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 202-203. The prophet Joel received a number of commendations from writers of the period for his description of a grasshopper plague. His account is weak, and in any case, probably refers to an attack by the Assyrians rather than grasshoppers. Dick, *Sod-House Frontier*, 203, 205; *Pacific Rural Press*, July 22, 1878, quoted in U. S. Entomological Commission, *Second Report of the Years 1878 and 1879, Relating to the Rocky Mountain Locust and the Western Cricket* (Washington, 1880), 247.

<sup>10</sup> Harold E. Briggs, "Grasshopper Plagues and Early Dakota Agriculture, 1864-1876," *Agricultural History*, 8:53 (April, 1934); Dick, *Sod-House Frontier*, 204-206; U. S. Entomological Commission, *Second Report*, 12; Taylor, "Grasshoppers of America," 209.

sky for an hour at a time, they leave the country over which they pass as bleak as if a fire had swept it. Millions may be killed, but like the war with China, there are ten to take the place of every one that falls. It is not profitable to raise grain for grasshoppers' use.<sup>11</sup>

Following the great plague of 1874, a number of Western governors issued proclamations for days of prayer; relief societies were formed within the states, and appeals were made to the East for help. The tide of empire was supposedly held up, but the census fails to show any decline in population. In fact, many persons were too poor to move.<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile, the immigrants continued to come west, and if land settlement was halted or slowed it was probably mostly in the minds of local editors. A brief quotation will serve to illustrate either the casual approach of historians or the stoic attitude of the foreign immigrant, and possibly both. "In 1876 woes struck the Svendsen family—measles, the death of Sigri, a scourge of grasshoppers that destroyed the crops, and other disappointments."<sup>13</sup> Perhaps some importance should be attached to the fact that a grasshopper plague was bracketed, however incidentally, with other disasters of life on the frontier.

Not every year was a plague year, and not every state or territory suffered on each occasion, but the Great Plains especially had to count grasshoppers among the most pervasive of its natural hazards. The most widespread and destructive plagues were those of 1855–1857, 1864–1867, and 1874–1876. Historians of various states usually indicate these and perhaps other invasions which caused the farmers, politicians, and general public to seek active measures to control the insect. Not until 1885, however, was poison bait used effectively to control grasshopper plagues.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *Pacific Rural Press* (July 22, 1878) quoted in U. S. Entomological Commission, *Second Report*, 247.

<sup>12</sup> Briggs, "Grasshopper Plagues," 58–59, 62; Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri," 7; Dick, *Sod-House Frontier*, 206–207; Briggs and Dick believe the westward surge was retarded. The evidence is not entirely convincing.

<sup>13</sup> Theodore C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America* (Northfield, 1940), 233.

<sup>14</sup> Briggs, "Grasshopper Plagues," 58–59; "Grasshoppers, Locusts, Crickets, Cockroaches, etc., of Minnesota," Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 55 (St. Paul, 1897), 98; Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri," 7; Dick, *Sod-House Frontier*, 207–208; Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 59–60; C. H. Richardson and L. E. Haas, "Evaluation of Stomach

The first methods of combatting the insect were no great improvement over techniques of antiquity. Early efforts included making noise, waving objects, and stamping on, or otherwise attempting to crush the insects. Some people caught them by hand or in nets. In Europe and Asia eggs were dug up by spade and carefully gathered, with bounties placed on amounts thus collected. In Cyprus, and other areas, holes were dug and net fences strung to converge on the pits, thus channeling the insects to central points where they were buried.<sup>15</sup> These methods of control required large amounts of labor, and, on the whole, were ineffective.

In most times and places, certain species of birds were recognized as enemies of the grasshopper and were protected as such. Writing in 1877, Samuel Aughey offered the protection of birds by game laws as the first of many devices which might be employed to control the insects. Perhaps popular support for such laws stemmed from farmer experience with grasshoppers.<sup>16</sup>

It had been widely assumed that the most efficient manner of combatting locusts was to destroy the eggs. Consequently fall plowing or harrowing was advocated. This was generally effective only in limited areas, because migratory grasshoppers seldom deposited eggs in cultivated fields, and because harrowing was not often extended to the pasture, roads, edges of fields, or other open areas where eggs were deposited. Furthermore, harrowing, to be of any use at all, had to be done by all the farmers of the region. Sparsity of settlement, to say nothing of uncooperative farmers, made the technique totally unworkable. It was also supposed that the trampling of horses and cattle destroyed eggs, but few eggs were destroyed that way. After several centuries, the buffalo had failed to achieve any notable results.<sup>17</sup>

The killing of unfledged grasshoppers was also suggested. As early as 1862, and possibly even before, it was noted that turkeys ate the insects in preference to other food, and it was recommended that flocks of these birds be kept to hold down the grasshopper hordes. Such advice was re-

Poisons for Grasshopper Baits," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 25:1078 (October, 1932).

<sup>15</sup> Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 44–45.

<sup>16</sup> S. Aughey, "Some Facts and Considerations Concerning the Beneficial Work of Birds," quoted in U. S. Entomological Commission for the Year 1877, *First Annual Report* (Washington, 1878), 338–350.

<sup>17</sup> Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 36, 44–45.

peated whenever there was a new invasion, and as late as 1916 the Department of Agriculture was still advocating the use of turkeys, chickens, and guinea fowl for checking outbreaks. These fowl were reputedly efficient but in time of plague it was noted that they quickly overate. Their usefulness ended in about an hour.<sup>18</sup> At length the Department of Agriculture recognized that turkeys soon tired of eating and they then merely hampered other better measures. As a result, the bird has not recently been recommended as a serious control agency.<sup>19</sup> The advice of the Department of Agriculture and of the various state departments, however, may have had influence in instituting turkey raising in the Plain States.

The prairie fires of the Great Plains evidently suggested burning over the plains in an effort to destroy grasshoppers. C. V. Riley and others urged this practice after the plagues of the Rocky Mountain locust in the 1870's. Since that time the technique has been consistently advocated by various authorities, but in the long war between man and the grasshopper, it seems not to have been very effective. One result of burning was to drive the insects from the plains onto cultivated land. Accordingly it was suggested that the fire be set at night so that the grasshoppers might not escape.<sup>20</sup> An incidental result of firing the plains was that it destroyed the wild food supply for future invading hordes, forcing them onto the cultivated areas.

Other techniques advocated and utilized at one time or another included the use of smudge pots, covering fruit trees with paper or cloth, digging ditches around fields with pits at intervals, and inundating breeding grounds. Sometimes these measures were successful, more often they were not. It was eventually discovered that the flood plain of the Mississippi, as well as other regularly inundated areas, generally provided excellent

breeding grounds. Such lands were often not put in cultivation. If they escaped flooding in any year, they provided a host of grasshoppers.<sup>21</sup>

Of all the attempts to destroy grasshoppers, none were so consistently pursued as those relating to the capture of the unwinged insects. Hand nets were employed extensively in ancient times. In 1826 one Arnold Thompson of Epsom, New Hampshire, managed to catch five bushels and three pecks of grasshoppers by using what was essentially a two-man net which was passed over the top of the grain in the evening when the insects were inactive.<sup>22</sup> This technique was seriously advocated as a remedial measure as late as 1862.

Procedures such as these apparently continued in use until the plains areas of the United States were reached. Then the hopperdozer made its appearance. It was mentioned in the *First Annual Report* of the United States Entomological Commission in 1878 and was apparently in use some time before that, possibly as early as the plague of 1857. There were many variations, but basically the device consisted of a pan filled with tar or water and coal oil, behind which there was a screen to prevent the escape of the insect. The machine was mounted on runners pulled by a horse. The grasshopper, startled at the approach of the sledge, jumped into the air, struck the screen, and fell into the pan. If tar was used, the grasshopper died quickly. When water and coal oil were used, the effect was supposed to be the same. If the grasshopper jumped out of the coal oil, it was confidently expected that it would soon die from contact with the poison. From 1880 to 1912 coal oil was more commonly used, and the supposed death of escaped grasshoppers was apparently a source of comfort to the farmers. Actually, brief contact with the coal oil was seldom fatal to the insect.

Sometimes the hopperdozer was modified to catch and bag insects, and one ingenious machine operated on the principle of a vacuum cleaner.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Harris, *Some Insects Injurious to Vegetation*, 191; F. B. Milliken, "Grasshoppers and Their Control on Sugar Beets and Truck Crops," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Farmers' Bulletin* 691 (Washington, 1915), 9; Dick, *Sod-House Frontier*, 204. The discovery of the relative inefficiency of turkeys and other fowl was made at least as early as 1874. The United States Department of Agriculture recognized the fact in 1920.

<sup>19</sup> T. B. Urbahns, "Grasshopper Control in the Pacific States," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Farmers' Bulletin* 1140 (Washington, 1920), 13.

<sup>20</sup> Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 41; U. S. Entomological Commission, *Second Report*, 16; Urbahns, "Grasshopper Control . . . Pacific States," 12.

<sup>21</sup> H. A. Morgan, "The Differential Grasshopper in the Mississippi Delta—Other Common Species," U. S. Division of Entomology, *Bulletin* 30, n.s. (Washington, 1901), 31.

<sup>22</sup> Harris, *Some Insects Injurious to Vegetation*, 189-190.

<sup>23</sup> U. S. Entomological Commission, *First Report*, 381-399; Washburn, "Modern Warfare Against Grasshoppers," 473. It is possibly significant that in 1877 a crushing machine was invented by one Michael Simpson of Boston, Mass. This might indicate that New



All of these devices required rather flat ground and were effective only against unfledged grasshoppers at a time when the grain was not high. The hopperdozer was limited, but the work accomplished by it was astounding. In 1888 some two hundred hopperdozers caught 5,000 bushels of grasshoppers in Minnesota, while the "Balloon hopper catcher" accounted for another 14,643 bushels. Since 7,000 insects were needed for a bushel, the catch was enormous. At times the ravages of grasshoppers were so severe that bounties were offered for their collection. This fact explains how information on amounts caught was recorded.<sup>24</sup>

The hopperdozer caught large numbers of the insects and often exhibited a great deal of mechanical ingenuity on the part of the designers, but the machines were merely an extension of the primitive hand net. Man had gone about as far as he could in the art and science of catching bugs.

All activities before 1885 were directed toward destroying the grasshopper before it had attained wings. Once the winged instar had been achieved, there had been no practical defense against the insect. But the development of new crops and farming methods and more particularly, the use of poison bait, changed the situation. These developments occurred at the same time that the frontier period was drawing to a close.

Writing in 1878, Charles V. Riley remarked:

We have never had much faith in the application to the plant or the insect of any chemical mixture, fluid, or powder, as a means of destroying the locusts; 1st, because nothing will more quickly or surely kill them than coal oil; 2d, because of the impracticability of using any such application on the extensive scale that would be necessary.<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless the government entomologists experimented with certain poisons. Those applied to plants were effective as a rule but the plant had to be eaten while the insecticide was functioning. This was obviously not desirable. Preparations which were applied directly to insects were frequently of no avail, and in any case, had to be constantly reapplied as new broods hatched. Baiting experiments with Paris green were directed toward finding a color which would attract the

insects, but the trial was unsuccessful. The early experimenter of the Entomological Commission concluded that coal oil, hopperdozers, and other measures were sufficiently effective.<sup>26</sup>

Meanwhile, grasshopper devastations continued. Between 1877 and 1883 there seems to have been a lull in their activity throughout the United States, although destruction occurred in limited areas. The red-legged grasshopper was reported to have destroyed the oat crop near St. James, Michigan, but the official report stated: "Such isolated reports as these come in nearly every year and only show that the species is not capable of concerted damage over any large area."<sup>27</sup>

This statement must have given scant comfort to the farmers of the afflicted region. The scattered small-scale but unceasing attacks, year after year, were hardly insignificant. The cumulative economic losses were considerable. New Hampshire and other areas of New England were invaded in 1883 and 1884. In 1885 Missouri, Montana, Dakota, parts of New England, and California were attacked.<sup>28</sup> In this year an experimenter used bran-arsenic mash in the San Joaquin Valley and found that it was highly effective. Use of this poison spread slowly. Apparently it was not tried in 1888 and 1889 when areas in Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Idaho were especially hard hit. In 1891 local species inflicted damage in Kansas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nebraska, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Indiana, and Iowa. Attacks continued in the Delta region in 1892, 1897, and 1898.<sup>29</sup> The "harmless" native species appeared in strength and became a widespread problem. Perhaps poison bait was used during these attacks but it was hardly extensive since the first record of its use in North Dakota was in 1892, while in 1898 the Extension Service in Minnesota still considered it effective only for small plots. Apparently it was not officially recommended in Missouri until 1905.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 400-403.

<sup>25</sup> Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 28.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 7; U. S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, *Insect Life* (Washington, 1889), 2: 10, 27, 69; Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri," 2.

<sup>27</sup> Riley, "Destructive Locusts," 7, 10, 59-60; "Reports on the Damage by Destructive Locusts During the Season 1891," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Bulletin* 27 (Washington, 1892), 25-26, 32-33; Morgan, "Differential Grasshopper in the Mississippi Delta . . .," 8.

<sup>28</sup> J. A. Munro, "Grasshoppers and Agricultural Development in North Dakota," *Journal of Economic*

England suffered from plagues at this date. U. S. Entomological Commission, *First Report*, 366.

<sup>29</sup> Walton, "Grasshopper Control," 15; Minnesota, *Bulletin* 55, 98.

<sup>30</sup> U. S. Entomological Commission, *First Report*, 399.

After 1892, the next serious outbreak to involve local species came in 1899. In Missouri entire corn fields were devoured; oats were cut from the stalk and pastures eaten to the ground. In the Mississippi Delta, the destruction was so great that frantic appeals were made to the Department of Agriculture, which responded by sending a South African fungus which it was hoped would spread among the grasshoppers and wipe them out. These fungus experiments of the United States Department of Agriculture lasted from 1895 until 1905, when they were finally abandoned as ineffective.<sup>31</sup> In the case of the Delta, it was discovered that only the migratory species seemed to be affected by the fungus, but the local species were doing the damage. The use of fungus was discontinued and reliance was placed on hopperdozers and spraying the locusts with kerosene. Poisoned bait was dismissed as impractical. In 1903 destruction by local species in several counties of Texas was countered by the use of poison bran, and from that time onward the technique seems to have been considered practical and its use advocated on a wide scale.<sup>32</sup>

The attacks continued with greater or less severity throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century. Montana suffered attacks in 1901, 1902, and 1903, and western states generally were forced to take action because of the ravages of 1909, 1910, and 1911.<sup>33</sup> "In 1913 occurred the worst outbreak seen in Kansas for years. People were forced to apply control measures on a larger scale than ever before."<sup>34</sup> It may be presumed that neighboring states also experienced some inroads from the insect. In these instances all the old procedures were employed, without outstanding success.

*Entomology*, 29:815; Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, *Annual Report* (Delano, 1898), 115; Jones, "Grasshopper Outbreaks in Missouri," 12.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 11; Morgan, "Differential Grasshopper in the Mississippi Delta . . .," 19-21; Parker, "Grasshoppers and Their Control," 15.

<sup>32</sup> Morgan, "Differential Grasshopper in the Mississippi Delta . . .," 19-21; E. O. Sanderson, "Report on Miscellaneous Cotton Insects in Texas," U. S. Bureau of Entomology, *Bulletin* 57 (Washington, 1906), 24-25.

<sup>33</sup> R. A. Cooley, J. R. Parker, and H. L. Seamans, "Grasshopper Control in Montana," Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, *Circular* 76 (Bozeman, 1918), 120; Washburn, "Modern Warfare Against Grasshoppers," 467.

<sup>34</sup> Milliken, "Grasshoppers and Their Control on Sugar Beets and Truck Crops," 2.

Since eradication was not often possible, attention was given to the problem of adjusting to life with the insect. As early as 1877 farmers had been advised to rotate crops, and in the West to turn to cattle raising in an effort to cut down on the destructiveness of the grasshopper. Range grass usually managed to escape extensive damage and it was early noted that sorghum was virtually immune to attack.<sup>35</sup> The two combined would support cattle raising and lessen the danger of grasshopper outbreaks. On the plains the farmers were urged to plant early maturing plants so that a crop might be harvested before the insects reached the winged stage, and the Department of Agriculture began the search for plants which would be more resistant to grasshoppers and other natural hazards. Despite the evidence, the change to sorghum was slow, possibly because the Department of Agriculture was following two conflicting policies: one of urging stock raising, and the other of searching for suitable cash crops. In any case, the entire nation could not turn to cattle raising and the goal of finding resistant crops was not achieved. For the country as a whole, reliance had to be placed on other measures, the most effective of which had been poison bran mash.

One of the chief objections to poison bran, and one which had been foreseen by government entomologists, was that it was expensive and required a great amount of work to be effectively applied. In the face of disaster, the farmers had grown accustomed to demanding help from state and national agencies. Frequently money was given to the farmers to meet an emergency, and at the same time cooperation was demanded of individuals. A program followed in Door County, Wisconsin, in 1924, is typical of many which resulted from the nationwide plagues from 1917 to 1926. First, the areas where eggs were deposited were discovered so that the program could be planned. Then the bait was mixed by machines, 400 pounds being turned out every six minutes. This was sacked and delivered by truck to various spreading districts, from whence it was delivered to the spreading crews. Here it was transferred to horse-drawn wagons, which followed the crews as they walked across country, distributing the poison.<sup>36</sup> The Door County program was from 86 to 93 percent effective, but it was not under-

<sup>35</sup> U. S. Entomological Commission, *First Report*, 130.

<sup>36</sup> A. A. Granovsky, "Organized Co-operative Campaign Against Grasshoppers in Wisconsin," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 18:73-83 (February, 1925).

taken until after several years of increasingly destructive attacks. Farmer individualism was strong.

During the spring and summer of 1931, south central South Dakota and northeastern Nebraska saw 17,000 square miles of crops 75 percent destroyed and 13,000 square miles 25 percent destroyed. Nothing much was done, for the counties were without agents to direct the work, or were without funds to carry it out.<sup>37</sup> This attack, combined with one in Iowa of the same year gave vivid warning of danger to come. So short is the memory of man, however, that A. G. Ruggles, writing in 1932, was compelled to remark:

For any one who has not seen an outbreak of grasshoppers it is very hard to visualize the damage done. When one is told that the crops were all destroyed he does not quite believe it. Only when one goes through the country and works with the insect at a given place does a realization of the great destruction come to him.<sup>38</sup>

And this was but the beginning. Destruction commenced in earnest in 1934, decreased slightly in 1935, and hit an all-time peak in 1936 when damage throughout the most affected states amounted to \$106,333,000, or more than the total gross income from all farm products in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming combined.<sup>39</sup>

The stories of the plague were similar to those of earlier years except that by the thirties automotive machinery was being clogged by the mass of grasshoppers. The insects made such a clean sweep in South Dakota that jackrabbits, faced with starvation, escaped into Nebraska.<sup>40</sup> The ravages continued unabated, left the ground open for wind and water erosion, and materially contributed to the Dust Bowl of the thirties. In 1939 another severe outbreak devastated vast regions: "Thousands of acres in Colorado, Wyoming, Ne-

braska, Iowa, the Dakotas, and Montana were literally eaten clean, stripped of grass, corn, vegetables, and other greenery by the inexorable advance of hordes of hoppers."<sup>41</sup> By 1941, however, the frequency and importance of grasshopper devastation had greatly decreased, due most probably to the wet cycle which arrived just before the United States entry into the war. This happy accident did much to allow the nation to meet the increased demand for food and fibre during the war. The grasshopper, at least, was not on the side of the enemy.

The attacks of the thirties had been met by the use of the established methods of control, chiefly the spreading of poison bait, but in 1943 the new insecticide, DDT, made its appearance. There was no great need for it during the war, however, and in any case, the armed forces used most of the available supply. After the war, although the grasshopper did some isolated damage, DDT was not used extensively in combatting the insect. From 1945 onward, a series of new insecticides made their appearance: chlordane, toxaphene, gamma BHC, aldrin, and others which supplanted DDT in the war against the grasshopper. By 1950, just as another plague was threatening to break out, the new insecticides were available to keep the grasshopper under control.<sup>42</sup>

Only time would reveal whether the problem had been solved, or whether the grasshoppers were merely awaiting another drought like that of the Thirties. Nevertheless, control of grasshoppers by the new insecticides was a definite possibility, and thus a summation of two centuries of history was appropriate.

First, and most obviously, there were certain material changes brought about which, in part at least, owed their origin to grasshopper ravages. As early as 1854 an entomologist had been assigned to the Division of Agriculture in the Patent Office. In 1863 this official was transferred to the Department of Agriculture, but the first significant

<sup>37</sup> J. R. Parker and R. L. Shotwell, "Devastation of a Large Area by the Differential and Two-Striped Grasshoppers," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 25: 174, 178 (April, 1932).

<sup>38</sup> A. G. Ruggles, "Observations on a Grasshopper Outbreak in Minnesota," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 25:188 (April, 1932).

<sup>39</sup> Parker, "Grasshoppers and Their Control," 4; *Agricultural Statistics*, 1938, 429.

<sup>40</sup> William L. Warden, "Nightmare on the Plains," *Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 2, 1950, p. 25; "Merciless Sun and Scourge of Insects," *Newsweek*, July 18, 1936, p. 8.

<sup>41</sup> Warden, "Nightmare on the Plains," 25.

<sup>42</sup> P. N. Annaud, and others, "Tests conducted by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine to Appraise the usefulness of DDT as an insecticide," *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 38:125, 148-149 (February, 1944); R. C. Roark, *A Digest on Information on Chlordane* (U. S. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, 1951), 22; Warden, "Nightmare on the Plains," 25; Claude Wakeland, "Toxaphene and Chlordane," *Agricultural Leaders Digest*, 31:26, 29 (March, 1950).



work was begun in 1877. In that year Congress authorized the establishment of an Entomological Commission as a result of the grasshopper plagues of 1874-1876.<sup>43</sup> It was from this Commission that the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine developed. This much is clear and distinct.

Furthermore, while other forces were at work, grasshopper ravages probably encouraged, in part, the shift from grain to livestock which occurred in the East prior to 1860. The same trend was apparent in the Great Plains in the 1880's and 1890's. A farmer might lose heavily in time of invasion but he still had his cattle; if he depended on grain, one attack would take all.<sup>44</sup>

Crop diversification was encouraged and practiced as a means of reducing the effects of attacks. If one crop suffered, another later one might succeed. Although turkeys seem never to have been very effective in destroying grasshoppers, it is interesting to note that the states which came to lead in turkey production were those particularly subject to attack. Texas, as would be natural, came first, followed by California, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Montana, Idaho, Colorado, and Oregon. In the period from 1929 to 1938 the greatest increase in turkey production occurred in 1936, by coincidence the year of the worst plague. The other leading years for turkeys were 1932 and 1933, years when locusts were also prominent.<sup>45</sup> The correlation may not be perfect, but the market mechanism cannot be fully responsible since the demand for turkey was not very great in 1936. The inference is inescapable: turkey production was fostered and continued by grasshopper ravages.<sup>46</sup>

Of new plants which were introduced into the United States, sorghum alone offered definite resistance to grasshopper attack, but farmers were slow to use the grass. With parity on wheat maintained at high levels, the temptation to run the risk of grasshoppers was great. Because of this, various scientists undertook to find and isolate a

resistant strain of wheat. The first report on this activity was made in 1949 and offered some hope of success.<sup>47</sup>

In addition to the use of resistant crops, other forms of accommodation were evident. The very earliest literature on the subject of grasshoppers suggested spring or fall plowing as a means of destroying eggs. By 1939 plowing with a mould-board plow to a depth of five inches was advised to prevent grasshoppers from reaching the surface. Fall plowing was preferred because it allowed the upper layer of soil to harden over the winter and spring. Spring plowing was to be followed by seeding with a press drill to keep the soil hard packed. Seeding directly into fresh grain stubble was condemned, although the practice was followed quite extensively. These methods were only supplementary, however, for in the end, chemistry provided the most satisfactory weapons.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, some of the tillage practices of the Great Plains undoubtedly stemmed from an effort to control grasshoppers.

In the realm of social results, the most outstanding fact was that the farmer alone could not meet the emergency. Of course there were a multitude of problems which the farmer could not solve unaided, but grasshopper destruction was more widespread, and suffering more acute than was the case in many other natural or market disasters. In addition, farmers were more or less accustomed to drought, plant disease, and other natural hazards, but for most of them the grasshopper was a new and terrifying phenomenon. The farmer was helpless; sometimes he gave up the battle. More often some sort of co-operation was attempted, but here conflicting theories and sparseness of settlement often hampered action. It should not be surprising to find that the hearty individualism of the settler crumpled before the plagues of insects, and that he should demand that the government do something.

Consequently in 1879, probably in response to pressure from the frontier, the government offered some relief to the settlers. The Congress passed a law which provided that:

... it shall be lawful for homestead and pre-emption settlers on the public lands, . . . where crops have been

<sup>43</sup> M. S. Eisenhower and A. P. Chew, "The United States Department of Agriculture, Its Structure and Functions," U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Miscellaneous Publication 88* (Washington, 1934), 95; Fred A. Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier* (New York, 1945), 284.

<sup>44</sup> In conventional history, the term "crop failure" usually includes locust destruction.

<sup>45</sup> *Agricultural Statistics*, 1939, p. 416.

<sup>46</sup> See also "Turning Pests into Profits," Oregon Department of Agriculture, *Bulletin 54* (June, 1936).

<sup>47</sup> R. Hehn and J. E. Grafius, "Resistance of Spring Wheat Varieties to Grasshopper Attack," *Agronomy Journal*, 41:467-469 (October, 1949).

<sup>48</sup> Parker, "Grasshoppers and Their Control," 30-34.



or may be destroyed or seriously injured by grasshoppers, to leave and be absent from said lands, under such rules and regulations as to proof of the same, as the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall prescribe; but in no case shall such absence extend beyond one year continuously; and during such absence no adverse rights shall attach to said lands, such settlers being allowed to resume and perfect their settlement as though no such absence had occurred.<sup>49</sup>

A law of 1890 permitted the settler whose crops had been destroyed by grasshoppers to defer payments due on his claim.<sup>50</sup> The settler was willing to demand relief, but he did not intend to surrender his land.

Strangely enough, grasshopper attacks were most severe at the time when the country was suffering from economic depressions. There is little reason to believe there were any casual relationships, but the effect has been to becloud the influence of the grasshopper. The conventional view that agrarian unrest stemmed from economic troubles and social isolation is probably valid. On the other hand, it may well be that farmers, faced with insoluble problems in the form of natural disasters, (grasshoppers prominent among them), struck out at railroads and money-lenders as oppressors who could at least be reached.

Great plagues and farmer movements do not coincide precisely, but the areas where both occurred do. More importantly, the long continued unrest and the constant damage of the grasshopper have possible connections. It made no great difference what the price of wheat was if only a third of a crop could be harvested, year in and year out. Continuing economic pressure probably stimulated political activity.

The Great Depression of the Thirties witnessed many efforts to alleviate the distress of farmers, distress made more acute by insect ravages. The chief attempts of the New Deal were directed

toward the economic problems, which were great, but many of the conservation measures indirectly concerned grasshopper devastation. Drought and poor tillage were not alone responsible for the denuded earth which blew away in the Thirties.

The more complete dependence of agriculture on the Federal Government in all fields was undoubtedly made easier by a tradition of accepting help which dated back to the previous great plagues, as well as to the inability of the current generation of farmers to finance the necessary programs. In reducing farmer independence, the role of the grasshopper has not been inconsiderable.

It has sometimes been maintained that the plagues of the 1870's halted westward migration. Admittedly, reports sent home by the settlers were not encouraging, and those who could afford to move did so, but many, particularly foreign immigrants, were too poor to migrate again. And in any case, the new immigrants were more stoical. At least, the chief migrants out of the afflicted areas were the Yankees.<sup>51</sup> The census, unfortunately, reports figures only for ten-year periods, and so some migration out, or a decrease of migration in, was possible, but for the period 1870-1880 there was a huge increase in population for all of the Western states. It is possible that all of this occurred in the space of two or three years, but it is not likely. Some left, many complained, but by and large, the settlers stuck it out.

The grasshopper was certainly a most persistent force in land settlement and in the development of agriculture, and deserves consideration as such. The buffalo are long since in national parks, the Indians on reservations, and the longhorn outmoded. The skin of the beaver is imported from Canada, and the Missouri mule is steadily being supplanted by the tractor. Only the grasshopper remains unchanged and perhaps uncontrolled.

<sup>51</sup> Solon J. Buck, *The Granger Movement* (Cambridge, 1913), 45-46; Briggs, "Grasshopper Plagues," 58-59; U. S. Bureau of the Census, 12th Census, 1900, *Population*, 1 (1): *passim*. (Washington, 1901).

<sup>49</sup> U. S. *Statutes at Large*, 21:48.

<sup>50</sup> U. S. *Statutes at Large*, 26:684-85.

## THE COLONY SYSTEM OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

OSCAR OSBURN WINTHER

*Indiana University*

The decade of the 1870's witnessed the rapid rise of Los Angeles as the metropolis of southern California.<sup>1</sup> An important aspect of this phenomenon was the emergence of "colonies" propinquitous to Los Angeles, a development largely dependent upon the sale and subdivision of this region's sprawling one-time Spanish ranchos. The founding of Anaheim as a colony in 1857 had set a precedent for such group enterprise and with the subsequent establishment of the Riverside community in 1870, the so-called "Colony System" began to flourish.

The importance of this particular aspect of southern California's development invites inquiry into the many and varied comments and often conflicting concepts regarding the colony system.<sup>2</sup> Certainly in addition to being, as many viewed it, a form of land transfer, or of land use, this particular colonizing process embodied a wide range of social philosophies, expressed but not devoutly adhered

to, and distinct types of community leadership and experiences. It is thought, therefore, that the present inquiry will provide a fuller understanding of the developments as they transpired during the short period separating the range cattle-sheep era and the beginning of the "Great Boom of the Eighties."

Contributing greatly not only to a general promotion of immigration to California but also in providing information on the subdivision aspects of the colony system was the officially endorsed and well financed California Immigrant Union, founded in 1869.<sup>3</sup> Through preparation and circulation of promotional literature and endorsement of particular subdivision projects, the Union called attention not only to general settlement possibilities in southern California (also elsewhere in the state), but likewise pointed to Anaheim Colony as a community worthy of being imitated.<sup>4</sup> Among the subdivision projects receiving the Union's official

<sup>1</sup> The substance of this article formed the basis of a paper read before the Institute of Historical Research, University of London. For an account of the development of Los Angeles, see Oscar Osburn Winther, "The Rise of Metropolitan Los Angeles, 1870-1900," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 10: 391-405 (August, 1947).

<sup>2</sup> Southern California's pioneer historian James M. Guinn, for many years connected with Anaheim's school system, defines a colony of the period under review as the banding together of people "from the East who were imbued with the same purpose." See James M. Guinn, *A History of California . . . and Los Angeles . . .* (3 vols., Los Angeles, 1915), 1: 297. A colony, said John Hayes, *Overland Monthly* correspondent, was "a company or association of settlers, who buy their land in one block and divide it themselves. . . ." See John Hayes, *The Overland Monthly*, 7: 450 (November, 1871). For other references to the system, see Robert W. Widney, "The Colony System of Southern California," *Illustrated Los Angeles Herald*, April, 1886, p. 11; William H. Bishop, "Southern California," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, 65: 870 (November, 1882). Bishop stresses that colonies were not founded by groups "bound together"; the land, he says, was sold to "whoever might wish to buy it."

<sup>3</sup> C. T. Hopkins, *Common Sense Applied to the Immigrant Question: Showing Why the 'California Immigrant Union' Was Founded and What it Expects to Do* (San Francisco, 1869). This is but one of several widely distributed booklets relating to the promotion of California settlement. In a *Report and Memorial* (ca. 1872), 3, of the Union it declared its sole purpose to be: "the preparation, publication, and gratuitous circulation of documents concerning the resources and attractions of California in the Eastern States, England and her provinces, and those portions of Europe from where we might hope to draw useful additions."

<sup>4</sup> One such significant brochure very widely circulated and often referred to was California Immigrant Union, *All about California and the Inducements to Settle There* (San Francisco, 1870). Hereafter referred to by title only. By 1875 this publication had gone through its eleventh large printing. The California Immigrant Union must not be thought of as the only agency sponsoring publications on southern California during the early 1880's. Some indication of the great variety of printed matter (very little directly concerned with the colony system) may be had from Oscar Osburn Winther, "The Use of Climate as a Means of Promoting Migration to Southern California," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 33: 411-24 (December, 1946).

blessings were Riverside, Long Beach, Westminster, San Fernando, and others that have had impressive growth as municipalities.<sup>5</sup>

In view of the repeated references to Anaheim as a sort of model for other projected colonies, one might take brief note of the procedures involved in establishing this particular settlement. Four major steps were involved, namely: organization of a group of Germans in the San Francisco Bay area into a joint stock company called the Los Angeles Vineyard Association; the use of an agent, George Hansen, to purchase what turned out to be Rancho San Juan Cajón de Santa Ana; contracting as an association for irrigation works and for planting well in advance of settlement; and, when all was in a fair state of readiness, arranging for the distribution of the property to individual members by lottery. In referring to this Anaheim formula the California Immigrant Union had this to say: "Had each of the original fifty settlers of the village located by himself, cut off from the encouraging sympathy and mutual counsel of congenial neighbors, it is doubtful whether success would have crowned the efforts of one fourth their number; but [by] adopting the colony plan, they have in twelve years advanced to a situation not only of comfort, but of comparative wealth."<sup>6</sup>

Much as future southern Californians came to regard Anaheim as the "Mother Colony," and much as it was looked upon as a sort of showplace to be visited by prospective settlers, this pre-Civil War community provided but one of many possible formulas for colony founding. Moreover, Anaheim was a matriarch in time-sense only, for none of the numerous succeeding colonies was in any way a direct offshoot of this German settlement.

Certainly a different set of circumstances led to the founding of Riverside, or what was first technically known as the Southern California Colony Association. For insight into the founding of Riverside one turns to the correspondence of its

<sup>5</sup> The California Immigrant Union would sponsor colonizing ventures by issuing over its name circulars announcing land sales. In other ways, too, this organization would lend support to colony promoters.

<sup>6</sup> *All About California and the Inducements to Settle There*, 46. Much other promotional literature of the period made reference to the Anaheim plan. See also Thompson and West, publishers, *History of Los Angeles County* (Oakland, 1880), 156. Hereafter referred to as Thompson and West, *Los Angeles. Wilmington Journal*, Wilmington, California, July 22, 1865.

founder, Judge John Wesley North.<sup>7</sup> During the Civil War North served as federal judge in Nevada, and perhaps at that time became interested in the settlement possibilities of southern California. At the close of the war he left Nevada, became an unsuccessful carpetbagger in Knoxville, Tennessee, where for a time he operated a foundry and machine shop. Then in 1870 North announced by circular the prospect of "A Colony for California" to be located in the southern part of the state near the Southern Pacific Railroad. He would form an organization which would purchase land sufficient for 10,000 people and, "Let this be subdivided and sold to the subscribers at the lowest figure practicable. . . ."<sup>8</sup> North moved fast in realizing his initial plans. During May, 1870, he proceeded to Los Angeles on a free railroad pass issued by C. P. Huntington, and with some followers began a search for suitable land. On September 7 he wrote his wife that he was negotiating for a tract 12 miles from the Mormon settlement at San Bernardino, a tract which may be described as Roubidoux Rancho and the eastern end of the Stearns or Jurupa Rancho.<sup>9</sup> "My task," wrote North, "has been to get for Eight thousand dollars  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a property that they first asked us \$60,000, for. You will see that I had to magnify myself somewhat to make them desire me. . . ."<sup>10</sup> Subsequent correspondence reveals how with uncommon fortitude the judge made his bargain. And on September 13 he was able to write his wife: "I have got  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the Stock of the company and paid for it."<sup>11</sup>

Having made the land purchase, the judge and his associates took immediate steps to reorganize and incorporate under the laws of the state of

<sup>7</sup> John Wesley North Correspondence, MSS and Miscellany, Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Hereafter referred to as "North Corr."

<sup>8</sup> Photostatic copy of announcement, Knoxville, Tennessee, March 17, 1870. North Corr.

<sup>9</sup> Letters, John W. North to Mrs. Ann North, wife, September, 1870, North Corr. See also Elmer W. Holmes, *History of Riverside County, California* (Los Angeles, 1912), 26-27. In 1870 this land was owned by a group known as the Silk Center Association which had been interested in silk production but had decided not to continue with this project following the death of T. W. Cover, its technical expert. See Robert Hornbeck, *Roubidoux's Ranch* (Riverside, 1913), 107-108.

<sup>10</sup> North to his wife, Los Angeles, September 7, 1870, North Corr.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, Los Angeles, September 13, 1870.

California as the Southern California Colony Association with North as both president and general agent. Without further delays surveyors were engaged to locate and plat what was to become the city of Riverside, to designate ten, twenty, and also larger farm acreages, and to locate the course of a proposed canal to convey water from the Santa Ana River for irrigation. A later circular issued by North reveals that land was offered for sale at prices ranging from \$2.50 to \$20 per acre with special inducements for those who would buy before January 1, 1871.<sup>12</sup>

Having accomplished these many tasks within very few months, Judge North wrote his wife with some exultation on September 20, 1870, "I am at last located on the site of our future city, on a beautiful dry plain, surrounded with varied, picturesque and sublime Mountain scenery . . . of surpassing beauty."<sup>13</sup> A shack was hastily erected which served as headquarters for the company and shelter for North and his associates in the field. Henceforth settlement activities proceeded on a solid basis at what was to become officially known as Riverside.

Public interest in Judge North's colonizing venture, augmented by accelerated railroad projection and construction in southern California, soon produced additional land-sale promotions patterned upon the Riverside formula. In 1872 San Francisco capitalists led by former governor of California, John G. Downey, organized the Cucamonga Homestead Association of Los Angeles County. Shares were sold, officers elected with Downey as president, and eight thousand acres of Cucamonga Rancho land was acquired and divided into tracts to be sold in sizes ranging from ten to eighty acres each. Water rights to San Antonio Creek were secured and "enough water" assured purchasers. Circulars were issued stressing the climatic and scenic advantages of Cucamonga as well as the "best quality" soil.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Circular issued by the Southern California Colony Association and signed by John W. North, October 10, 1870. Photostat, North Corr.

<sup>13</sup> North to his wife, "Jurupa" (site of Riverside colony), September 20, 1870. North Corr. In this letter he disclosed that as of the time of writing there was on this large tract "not a board to shelter us."

<sup>14</sup> Cucamonga Real Estate Circular, n.p., April 24, 1872; Cucamonga Homestead Association of Los Angeles, California (Los Angeles, 1874); By-laws of the Cucamonga Homestead Association (Los Angeles, 1874); *Cucamonga* (Los Angeles, ca. 1874). These

The year following the organization of the Cucamonga venture, came the formation of the Slover Mountain Colony Association which led to the emergence of Colton and Pomona. William H. Mintzner, president of this concern, arranged the purchase of two thousand acres of land along with rights to Santa Ana River water. The following year, 1874, this acreage was also subdivided into small parcels and offered for public sale. The Association's first, and for several months the only, resident was Dr. W. R. Fox, but the year 1875 witnessed the beginning of active settlement of what is now Colton.<sup>15</sup> At about the same time a group of Los Angeles speculators purchased 5,600 acres belonging to Rancho San Jose for colony development. They incorporated themselves in 1874 as the Los Angeles Immigrant and Land Cooperative Association, with a \$250,000 capitalization. Portions of Rancho San Jose were then laid out in town lots—now Pomona. Shares in the concern were offered at one thousand dollars each, and the subdivided property along with water rights went on general sale February 22, 1876.<sup>16</sup>

Numerous and active as were those colony promotional schemes at the very opening of the 1870's, it was 1873 before serious interest centered upon the magnificent Rancho San Pasqual (now Pasadena) at the very doorstep of Los Angeles. In that year Dr. John S. Griffin, owner of four thousand acres of this rancho, became actively interested in sale. This decision coincided with the arrival at Los Angeles from Indianapolis of D. M. Berry, purchasing agent for a group from his home city, organized as the California Colony of Indiana.<sup>17</sup> Berry had made an extensive search in the areas around Santa Barbara, San Diego, and Anaheim before being shown San Pasqual by local Judge Benjamin Eaton.<sup>18</sup> Upon seeing San

assorted materials are in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>15</sup> Luther A. Ingersoll, *Ingersoll's Century Annals of San Bernardino County, 1769 to 1904* (Los Angeles, 1904), 551.

<sup>16</sup> Roy L. Driscoll, *Pomona Valley Community Book* (Pomona, 1950), 43-44. Thompson and West, *Los Angeles County*, 134.

<sup>17</sup> W. W. Robinson, *Ranchos Become Cities* (Pasadena, 1939), 183-85.

<sup>18</sup> The correspondence of D. M. Berry with Thomas B. Elliott, his brother-in-law, and with his sister, reveal developments relative to formation of the Pasadena Colony. This correspondence is part of the



Pasqual, Berry realized that he needed to go no farther, and he wrote to this effect to his brother-in-law Dr. Thomas S. Elliott, an Indianapolis commission merchant and president of the Indiana Company. Berry related that he had found a tract of "2800 acres at \$10 an acre," only four miles from Los Angeles; of this "about 500 acres a wooded and watered canyon, suitable for wood and cattle grazing. . . . Half cash, balance in year. . . . The climate and scenery are heavenly."<sup>19</sup>

Urgent as Berry's letters appeared, there was general reluctance on the part of the Indiana group (some had been losing heavily in the financial panic of that year) to authorize the recommended purchase and to join the proposed settlement. Following months of what seemed to Berry interminable waiting, a reorganization occurred. The original Indiana Company was superseded by the San Gabriel Orange Grove Association which in December, 1873, purchased the available tract for \$25,000 with funds derived from the sale of shares at \$250 each. According to its prospectus this company would begin colony operations "on a basis of Fifty Families, but may increase to any number." As many as one hundred sixty acres of land, plus a town lot of two acres, would go to each member at a cost of three dollars per acre.<sup>20</sup> Berry, meanwhile, had entered into a partnership—The Los Angeles Real Estate Agency—and on January 27, 1874, he and the directors of the revamped colony association invited all shareholders out to the tract where after a picnic dinner there was a roll call and distribution of the land by a system of lottery. Individual colonists received 15 acres for each share held. A reservoir retaining three million gallons of water had been completed in the canyon above the valley and the business of housebuilding and tilling of the soil could proceed without further delay.<sup>21</sup> After some discussion concerning a name for the new community, in which "Hoosier"<sup>22</sup> was suggested, agreement was

reached on "Pasadena." The word was understood to mean "Crown of the Valley."<sup>23</sup>

The trend toward subdivision was not limited to the Los Angeles-San Bernardino axis. Directly south of Pasadena, about twenty-five miles, lay the coast. Here it was that Willmore City, subsequently Long Beach, emerged. First colonizing developments occurred when in 1870 William Erwin Willmore—a total stranger to California—disembarked from a vessel at the Wilmington dock, walked out toward Anaheim, saw and took a great fancy to Rancho Los Cerritos, and then proceeded immediately with plans to found there what was to be called "The American Colony."<sup>24</sup> During the 1870's, much planning and work was done to establish this colony, but not until the following decade was the land platted and sold at auction to the general public.<sup>25</sup>

Last of the successful southern California colo-

<sup>19</sup> Harold D. Carey, *History of Pasadena* . . . (Chicago, 1930), 283 ff.; Wood, *Pasadena*, 85.

<sup>20</sup> Walter H. Case, *History of Long Beach and Vicinity* (2 vols., Chicago, 1927), 1: 67-73; see also miscellaneous historical sketches in "Long Beach Collection," Long Beach Public Library; in particular see "Long Beach From Village to Metropolis," *Long Beach Press-Telegram*, February 10, 1938. Hereafter referred to as the "Long Beach Coll."

<sup>21</sup> *Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express*, December 24, 1880; Case, *History of Long Beach*, 1: 67-73; also miscellany in Long Beach Coll. Subdivision of agricultural lands in southern California followed other patterns than those discussed here under the heading "Colony Systems." Several subdivisions were made and agricultural communities emerged without corporate organizations. Santa Ana, Richland (later Orange), Tustin, and Westminster serve as illustrations. Santa Ana emerged in 1869 when William H. Spurgeon purchased a seventy-six acre tract of the Rancho Santa Ana lands and in 1870 laid out and founded the town of Santa Ana on the lower portion of the river for which the town was named. Small farms had already made their appearance in this neighborhood by the time of Spurgeon's arrival, so that a non-corporate colony was in the making. At Westminster the Reverend L. P. Webber, who in 1871 secured a hold on portions of Rancho Alamitos, induced families to settle on his holding in order that as he phrased it, they might "get all the advantages of an old settlement from the beginning." *The Blade, Extra Number*, Santa Ana, November, 1905, 2, 3, 13; Thompson and West, *Los Angeles*, 159; Samuel Armor, ed., *History of Orange County, California* (Los Angeles, 1911) 30, 50; *History of Santa Ana: City and County* . . . (Santa Ana, 1887), 5.

Bandini Collection, Henry E. Huntington Library. Hereafter referred to as the "Bandini Coll., MSS."

<sup>19</sup> D. M. Berry to T. B. Elliott, September 12, 1873, in *ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> This "Prospectus and Articles of Agreement" appear in full in John W. Wood, *Pasadena, California: Historical and Personal* (n.p., 1917), 54; Robert G. Cleland, *The Twilight Cavalcade, 1895-1945*. A paper read at the Twilight Club, Pasadena, October 16, 1945 (n.p., n.d.), 3-5.

<sup>21</sup> Robinson, *Ranchos*, 183-84.

<sup>22</sup> Berry to Elliott, March 14, 1874, Bandini Coll. MSS.

nies founded during the 1870's was Lompoc, Santa Barbara County. There a group brought together by a common ideal formed the Lompoc Valley Land Company and purchased 33,000 acres of Lompoc Rancho. The land, some well suited for diversified agriculture and some suitable for grazing purposes, was subdivided into tracts of forty acres or more and sold at public auction at prices ranging from fifteen to sixty dollars per acre.<sup>26</sup> Viewed as a whole, colony founding in southern California during the 1870's represented, in the opinion of O. L. Abbott, one-time secretary of the California State Grange, an improvement over the outmoded system wherein "old citizens" benefited by "the new ones being plucked." The new "colony system" enabled all stockholders in an incorporated enterprise to participate on a basis of relative equality.<sup>27</sup>

Important as were the foregoing processes in facilitating the procurement, subdivision, and resale of the rancho lands, the social implications of the colony system should not be ignored. A definite communal philosophy was present in the Anaheim experiment, and many and varying social ideologies found expression in connection with the subsequent founding of other communities. Recurrent, for example, is the co-operative idea, although adherence to such a principle was admittedly weak. In the case of Anaheim the co-operative principle was neither expressed nor practiced to a degree comparable with earlier utopian communities, as for example, New Harmony in southern Indiana. Nevertheless, the founding fathers of Anaheim did, as previously indicated, band together to achieve a common purpose. In the opinion of one later observer Anaheim, while in no sense a utopian community, was instead a "pure democracy." Individuals were as free there as elsewhere to do as they liked, but these colonists, with their strong German backgrounds, allowed them-

selves to become a closely knit, yet easy-going community.<sup>28</sup>

Whatever Anaheim may or may not have been in the way of a "Utopian" community, the place did attract attention both at home and abroad. In 1876 it became the special object of interest of some German-speaking Poles in Poland whose unhappiness with Russian rule caused them to seek refuge in the United States, specifically at Anaheim. In southern California they hoped to establish themselves in accordance with Brook Farm principles. Active in this group were Count Bizenta Chlapowski and his famed actress wife, Madame Helen Modjeska, and some of their close associates. At Anaheim the actress, to use her own words, hoped to "live in the midst of nature, perhaps in a tent! I pictured to myself," she recalled later, "a life of toil under the blue skies of California, among the hills, riding on horseback with a gun over my shoulder."<sup>29</sup> What had begun as sheer romanticizing about a free new world was soon translated into action and July, 1876, witnessed a party of eight Poles—unskilled in agriculture—aboard ship with Anaheim Landing, California, their destination. Madame Modjeska recounts the efforts of her impractical countrymen to make a living from "Mother Earth." Much as they tried, none seemed capable of coping with the requirements of pioneer living, at best not severe in southern California, and it was not long before the utopian dream was shattered. "We all came to the conclusion," wrote Madame Modjeska, "that our farming was not a success. Everything seemed to be a sad failure." In January, 1877, the Count and his family departed for San Francisco. He had lost fifteen thousand dollars in a venture he still hoped would succeed for his Polish friends left behind. Some of them did remain and in time adapted themselves to the pattern so successfully established by the German founders of Anaheim.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> *Lompoc Record*, April 10, 1875. *Ibid.*, the September 25, 1875, issue of this newspaper carried advertisements laying down terms of sale.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, May 15, 1875. It is recognized that other methods, many successful, were used in implementing subdivision of the ranchos. Towns having their beginning before and during the decade under review developed with varying degrees of success without benefit of the so-called "colony system." Monte, Newhall, Downey, San Fernando, and San Gabriel are other communities which emerged and expanded by patterns differing from the colony system.

<sup>28</sup> George H. Fitch, "Colony Life in Southern California," *The Cosmopolitan*, 2: 155-156 (November, 1886). See also William H. B. Haywood, "A California Colony," *The California Illustrated Magazine*, 1: 198-208 (February, 1892); *Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express*, April 1, 1886.

<sup>29</sup> Helen Modjeska, *Memories and Impressions of: An Autobiography* (New York, 1910), 249.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 265 ff., 304-305. See also Lucile E. Dickson, "The Founding and Early History of Anaheim, California," *Annual Publications*, Historical Society of Southern California, 11 (1919), 35.

Not unlike the Anaheim settlers the founders of Riverside gave some thought to their common economic and social problems. Whatever philosophy Judge North, the organizer of the colony, may have possessed about community living, it appeared to have been fairly well formulated before his visit to Anaheim early in the summer of 1870. North was the son of a Methodist minister and the descendant of a long line of devoutly religious people in New York state. During pre-Civil War years North had been an active abolitionist speaker. As a lawyer and politician in Minnesota, he had shown his disposition to found community enterprises. As a member of the Minnesota territorial legislature, North introduced the bill which when enacted into law provided for the establishment of the University of Minnesota and he was also instrumental in founding Northfield, Minnesota.<sup>31</sup>

The judge's numerous letters to his wife and daughter also betray a keen and deep interest in community experiments, and there are recurring references in his correspondence to Brook Farm. He would write, as for example: "I have just been reveling in *Overland Monthly* for July, the article about 'Brook Farm.'"<sup>32</sup> In a letter to his daughter Emma, residing at DeWitt, Onandoga County, New York, North revealed how he believed himself greatly influenced by Samuel J. May, a Syracuse minister of the gospel and a reformer, who in turn had been an advocate of liberal religious and social movements.<sup>33</sup>

It is, therefore, not surprising that the founder of Riverside wanted at the very outset "to form a colony of intelligent, industrious and enterprising people, so that each one's industry will help to promote his neighbor's interests, as well as his own." In his community the judge wanted his co-founders to "enjoy all the advantages which a first class Town affords. We expect to have Schools,

Churches, Lyceum [sic], Public Library, Reading-room, etc. at a very early day. . . ." To his colony, therefore, were invited only persons with "good character."<sup>34</sup> No formal investigations into the personal histories of prospective members of the Southern California Colony Association appear to have been made. There are, nevertheless, clear indications that those who first joined the venture strove to meet standards set by the founder.

Even more intent than Judge North upon making his colony socially purposeful was Willmore, the founder of Willmore City (Long Beach). Not much is known of this English immigrant, but available information points to a somewhat self-righteous person possessed of a strong urge to promote. His American Colony was to be based upon moral and temperance principles. The Methodist Church (he hoped for transfer of the Methodist University of Southern California from Los Angeles to his colony) was especially welcomed. As a Los Angeles agent for the California Immigrant Union, Willmore traveled into the Northwest and Middle West to advance what he called his "American Enterprise." There is evidence that the first excursionists he induced to view his seaside project were strongly religious persons from Kansas City.<sup>35</sup> It remained for others, a decade later, to realize in part Willmore's dream. Failing in his immediate objectives the founder took leave of southern California. For a time he was in Arizona, but finally returned to Los Angeles County where in 1901 he ended his days, unhappily as a public charge.<sup>36</sup>

The group most active in pursuance of principles was Lompoc colony; it was devoted to the cause of temperance. Settlers there looked upon Vineland, a temperance community in New Jersey founded by Charles K. Landis, as a model. In adopting its by-laws and regulations, the Lompoc Valley Land

<sup>31</sup> William W. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota* (4 vols., St. Paul, 1921-1930), 1: 261, 399, 403, 413, 414; James Gray, *The University of Minnesota* (Minneapolis, 1951), 16, 17, 22; John Brown and James Boyd, *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties* (3 vols., Madison, 1922), 1: 353-54.

<sup>32</sup> North to his wife, Los Angeles, June 26, 1870, North Corr. The article alluded to is Mrs. Georgiana B. Kirby, "My First Visit to Brook Farm," *The Overland Monthly*, 5: 9-19 (July, 1870).

<sup>33</sup> North to his daughter, Miss Emma B. North, Riverside, July 23, 1871, North Corr.

<sup>34</sup> Announcement, March 17, 1870. *Supra*. North Corr.; Hornbeck, *Roubidoux's Ranch*, 108-109, warned his readers that the word "colony" as applied to Riverside was a misnomer if the term should be taken to mean a "cooperative" colony. He contends, however, that cooperative spirit was strong at Riverside and that it was "crowned with the greatest success."

<sup>35</sup> *Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express*, December 24, 1880; February 2, 1881; *Long Beach Press Telegram*, February 10, 1938. See also miscellaneous clippings containing reminiscent statements by Long Beach pioneers, Long Beach Coll.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*.

Company strove to eliminate the "baseful and demoralizing effects of the saloon."<sup>37</sup> In referring to these principles the *Lompoc Record*, April 10, 1875, said: "... the colony is established upon just moral principles. The sale and manufacture of liquor is forever prohibited upon any of the colony lands, and, as far as it is possible, this restriction will be enforced."<sup>38</sup> George Roberts, secretary of the company, received many letters from outsiders who expressed great interest in joining this temperance community. One such letter came from Roseburg, Oregon, where, said the writer, "We are all disgusted with the demoralization resulting from the rum traffic and long to get where barroom and brothel are not confronting us on every corner."<sup>39</sup>

No such extreme views as those at Lompoc were asserted by the founders of Pasadena. The founders did, however, declare, "We, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a colony for Co-operative Farming. . . ." And further that: "Any person, of good moral character, who shall be accepted by the Executive Committee, shall be eligible for membership."<sup>40</sup> In spite of Berry's being strongly opposed to clergymen—"Ministers are generally 'bilques,'" he wrote—and opposed to "high toned hypocrisy," such as he thought existed at Santa Barbara, the Crown Colony continued to attract sober, conservative, church-going people.<sup>41</sup>

At neighboring Pomona and Colton, the emphasis appears to have been placed upon bargain values in real estate rather than on lip service to avowed moral principles, but Cucamonga was advertised simply as a place where "romance welcomes" and neither nationality nor religious

beliefs would be scrutinized.<sup>42</sup> Taken as a whole, appeals coming from the general agents of the several colonies were for "moral," God-fearing settlers who were also, as the California Immigrant Union would have them be: "persons skilled in a great variety of agricultural pursuits"; families from the states and the "industrious classes from Europe."<sup>43</sup>

It must not be assumed that the colony makers worked without regard for influence from other promotional agencies within the area. The first Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce was organized in 1873 and its appeal for general immigration was strong; so too was that of the Southern Pacific Railroad which connected with Los Angeles in 1876. Hotel and resort interests likewise broadcast far and wide the seeming virtues of southern California: "A Land of Glorious Sunset."<sup>44</sup> In view of this mounting publicity in behalf of the region during the 1870's, it is apparent that many of those who migrated to southern California, and who cast their lot with one of the above mentioned colonies, did so without either special inducement by promoters of the colony system or by meeting formal requirements laid down by any of the colony associations.

Response to promotions was early noticeable, and an item such as the following in Anaheim's *Southern Californian* (1872) is typical: "We hear daily of teams going south, . . . bringing with them furniture and farming implements, and followed by lighter wagons and buggies, filled with the families of the hardy pioneers. . . ." And then this newspaper asked a pertinent question: "... from whence cometh this multitude?"<sup>45</sup>

Data now obtainable from the 1880 "Population Schedules" provide some, albeit inadequate, information pertaining to this question of origin of

<sup>37</sup> *Lompoc Record*, April 17, 1875; September 4, 1875.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, April 10, 1875. A prohibition clause was contained in every contract for either the sale or leasing of land. See *ibid.*, September 25, 1875.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, November 13, 1875.

<sup>40</sup> Wood, *Pasadena*, 56. Formally, Pasadena espoused no clearly defined moral philosophy, not even temperance. In its early history, according to E. P. Clarke, "Prohibition in Southern California," *Overland Monthly*, Second Series, 15: 377 (April, 1890), "Pasadena had depended on the strength of its temperance sentiment" rather than upon law. A crisis known as "The Whiskey War in Pasadena" broke out in 1884 and disrupted this community's moral self-reliance.

<sup>41</sup> Berry to Mrs. Helen Elliott, January 1, 1874; Berry to Elliott, January 13, 1874. Bandini Coll., MSS.

<sup>42</sup> Ingersoll, *Ingersoll's Annals of San Bernardino County*, 551.

<sup>43</sup> *Facts About California and the Inducements to Settle There*.

<sup>44</sup> Winther, "The Use of Climate as a Means of Promoting Migration to Southern California," 411-415. A check on the holdings with a few midwestern historical society libraries gave some clues as to types of promotional material circulated in these areas. A large assortment of this type of literature, mostly pamphlet material, is available at the Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>45</sup> *Southern Californian*, November 9, 1872.



the settlers.<sup>46</sup> The following tabulations indicate the number of heads of families with representative townships embracing: Anaheim, the earliest colony; Riverside, the first colony of the decade under review; Santa Ana, a community which, as stated, emerged without highly organized promotion; and Ventura, an old Spanish-Mexican community.

*Nativity Figures Based on "Population Schedules" for 1880<sup>47</sup>*

NATIVITY OF FAMILY HEADS	ANA-HEIM TOWN-SHIP	RIVER-SIDE PRE-CINCT	SANTA ANA TOWN-SHIP	VEN-TURA TOWN-SHIP
<i>United States</i>				
Alabama.....	2			
Arizona.....		1		
Arkansas.....	5	1	1	1
California.....	5	27	13	44
Connecticut.....	2	3	1	2
Delaware.....	1			
Georgia.....		1		
Illinois.....	5	10	15	8
Indiana.....	2	10	11	7
Iowa.....	3	2	5	3
Kentucky.....	2	4	8	3
Louisiana.....	3	3		1
Maine.....	1	19	3	7
Maryland.....	1	1		
Massachusetts.....	3	30	1	7
Michigan.....	1	6	2	4
Minnesota.....		1		
Mississippi.....	2		2	
Missouri.....	6	2	25	10
New Hampshire.....	1	2	1	
New Jersey.....	2	1	1	
New Mexico.....		11		
New York.....	14	21	25	16

<sup>46</sup> "Population Schedules for 1880," namely those pertaining to the following California counties: Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Santa Barbara. Courtesy of the National Archives, Washington, D. C. Nativity data not found in the published United States Census for 1880 appears on the schedules; the tabulation is by towns, townships, and precincts. It must be understood here that the area of a given colony did not necessarily coincide with that of a corresponding political subdivision. At best the data may be an approximation, but they provide information considerably more substantial than that derived from contemporaries who guessed about the make-up of a given community.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* It is estimated there were on the average five in each family.

NATIVITY OF FAMILY HEADS	ANA-HEIM TOWN-SHIP	RIVER-SIDE PRE-CINCT	SANTA ANA TOWN-SHIP	VEN-TURA TOWN-SHIP
<i>United States (Cont.)</i>				
North Carolina.....	1	1	1	1
Ohio.....	6	20	15	14
Pennsylvania.....	7	10	11	9
Rhode Island.....		1		
South Carolina.....		1	4	
Tennessee.....	5	2	11	
Texas.....	1		2	1
Utah.....			1	1
Vermont.....	3	8	2	2
Virginia.....	3		9	1
Wisconsin.....	1	3	2	4
<i>Foreign Born</i>				
Australia.....		1		
Austria.....	3		1	1
Belgium.....		1		
Canada.....	4	19		9
China.....	2	1	5	8
Chile.....				1
Denmark.....	3		1	
England.....	14	12	13	10
Finland.....			1	
France.....	3		10	4
Germany.....	20	6	8	17
(Lorraine)			1	
Holland.....	1			
Ireland.....	5	4	4	10
Italy.....				4
Mexico.....	1	17	3	23
Norway.....	1			
Nova Scotia.....			3	
Portugal.....			1	
Russia.....				1
Scotland.....	6	3	3	1
Spain.....				5
Sweden.....		1		
Switzerland.....	1			2

So far as those who settled in the colonies are concerned, it is clear from sources available that most of them were either farmers by profession or professional people or mechanics—the latter eager for a change and a chance to give farming a try in this much acclaimed land of sunshine. There were, of course, those who followed exclusively business and professional careers, and their numbers increased as towns emerged and expanded. Merchants, small industrialists, and professional people generally had no reason to consider their lives in these new communities either exciting or novel; most farmers, on the other hand, were confronted

with new methods of soil cultivation (methods involving irrigation), harvesting, and crop marketing.

Prior to their arrival, most of the first settlers at Anaheim had been artisans and mechanics, persons largely unfamiliar with crop production of any kind, yet as members of the Vineyard Association they committed themselves to viticulture.<sup>48</sup> It was because of this lack of knowledge and experience with agriculture that the Anaheim settlers first employed technical assistance, not only in bringing water to their acres but in the planting of the vine. Hard work and perseverance made their colony a success. Their biggest problem was to produce wine acceptable to the American market since mission wines had been regarded as inferior. That these challenges were met is indicated by the production by 1868 of no less than 600,000 gallons of wine, some of which even went into foreign markets.<sup>49</sup> Anaheim continued as a successful wine-producing colony until 1884-85 when disease inflicted wide-spread damage upon the vineyards; thereafter more diversified agriculture prevailed.<sup>50</sup> As for a question asked by the *Southern-Californian* in 1872, "Shall Anaheim be a suburb of Los Angeles, or the metropolis of southern California?" the answer was definite by 1880; it was obliged to accept the more modest role.<sup>51</sup> Even so, the coming of the Southern Pacific Railroad to Anaheim gave renewed vitality to this first colony, and what had originally been a "cactus bed" developed into a flourishing agricultural community.<sup>52</sup>

Bright as the prospects for Riverside colony appeared to its promoters, the first years did not pass without a struggle. In a brief history prepared by James P. Greeves, the pioneer doctor and secretary of the original colony organization, one notes items such as the following: "For the first ten months all the water for household purposes

and the watering of trees and vines had to be carted in barrels, one mile or over, from the river. As fast as our trees and vines leaved out, they were eaten off by grasshoppers." Then came water from the canal and by mid-decade "a more cheerful future was apparent."<sup>53</sup> A newspaper reporter from neighboring San Bernardino visited Riverside in 1874 and declared the community to be "one of the most charming localities in southern California." He was amazed that what four years earlier had been an "uncultivated waste" had been transformed into a "rich, productive and beautiful agricultural and horticultural section which 'ere long will be without a rival in California."<sup>54</sup> By the close of the decade it was clear that a solid foundation had been laid not only in establishing Riverside as a "haven of quiet and rest" for those from the East suffering from "nervous prostration,"<sup>55</sup> but as a producer of a new and popular species of citrus fruit—the Bahia (Brazil) navel orange.<sup>56</sup> As orchards either planted or grafted with this variety came into bearing, as improved irrigation methods were devised, and as better plans for marketing of citrus fruits were put into operation, it may be said that Riverside achieved an enviable status among its sister colonies.

Pasadena, the "Crown Colony," appears to have been blessed from the outset, and therefore was spared many of the hardships suffered by most pioneer communities. It had an abundant water supply—"God's free beverage"—and the emphasis upon orange production was, in spite of pests and market gluts, rewarding. By 1880 the *Los Angeles Herald* wrote as follows about Pasadena: "The improvements that have been made are almost marvellous. . . . The land is owned in lots of ten to thirty acres, and almost every lot has a comfortable house on it, set back, and being approached by a drive through an orange grove."<sup>57</sup> Cucamonga and Pomona, too, moved ahead, but more slowly than did other communities. The latter experienced its first boom development in the decade of the 1880's as did also the American Colony (Long Beach). Lompoc, after its rather dramatic beginnings,

<sup>48</sup> Dickson, "The Founding and Early History of Anaheim, California," 29-30, states that not one of the settlers was a farmer and only one knew anything about wine making.

<sup>49</sup> Vincent P. Carosso, "Anaheim, California: A Nineteenth Century Experiment in Commercial Viticulture," *Business Historical Society Bulletin*, 23: 85 (June, 1949).

<sup>50</sup> Raymond M. Holt, "The Fruits of Viticulture in Orange County," *The Quarterly*, Historical Society of Southern California, 28: 11 (March, 1946).

<sup>51</sup> *Southern Californian*, December 28, 1872.

<sup>52</sup> *Annaheim Gazette*, January 9, 1875.

<sup>53</sup> *Riverside Weekly News*, March 3, 1877.

<sup>54</sup> *San Bernardino Weekly Argus*, August 31, 1874.

<sup>55</sup> *Riverside Weekly News*, April 7, 1877.

<sup>56</sup> Neptune Fogelberg and A. W. McKay, *The Citrus Industry and the California Fruit Growers Exchange System* (Washington, D. C., 1940), 3.

<sup>57</sup> *Los Angeles Herald*, June 5, 1880; see also Wood, *Pasadena*, ch. 10.

progressed slowly as an agricultural settlement. In 1880 the population of Lompoc was about 200.<sup>48</sup> In retrospect the decade of the 1870's witnessed fundamental changes in land settlement

<sup>48</sup> Jesse D. Mason, *History of Santa Barbara County*,

and use in southern California. Contributing significantly to this transformation was the colony system.

*California* (Oakland, 1883), 286; Driscoll, *Pomona Valley Community Book*, 43 ff.

## FARM WAGE BOARDS UNDER THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

SAMUEL LISS

*Farmers Home Administration, United States Department of Agriculture*

The agricultural wage boards, which operated under the direction of the Cooperative Extension Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the State land-grant colleges, came into existence in 1943 and were terminated at the end of the crop season in 1946. They were county bodies which replaced the State agricultural wage boards, commonly known as the State-USA Wage Boards, which operated under the direction of the Farm Security Administration of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.<sup>1</sup> Just as the latter functioned as integral parts of the Department's Farm Labor Transportation Program, so did the former serve as instruments of a federal farm labor supply program conducted jointly by the Cooperative Extension Service and the War Food Administration.

The basic purpose and function of the Extension Service County Wage Boards were identical with those of their predecessors, namely: to ascertain prevailing wages for specific agricultural operations in given crop-production areas in order to facilitate the recruitment, transportation and placement of domestic and foreign farm labor, including prisoners of war, throughout the United States. They differed with their predecessors, however, in structure, in the geographic scope of their juris-

diction, and in the procedural details associated with their operations.

The liquidation of the State USDA Wage Boards and their replacement by the Extension Service County Wage Boards was occasioned by a shift in administrative and operational responsibilities for farm labor supply programs of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. These changes were initiated by the enactment of legislation in April 1943 which, for the first time during the war, established a statutory basis for the Department's special farm labor procurement and transportation program. Prior thereto, these special programs were based on executive authority and financed by the President's Emergency Fund.<sup>2</sup> Public Law 45 (78th Congress) appropriated \$26,100,000 to be expended during the balance of the 1943 calendar year by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, U. S. Department of Agriculture, and later by the War Food Administrator for the purpose of "assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> War Manpower Commission, Directive No. 7, June 24, 1942.

<sup>3</sup> The essential provisions of this Act were incorporated in subsequent legislation, as follows: a) Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act for the calendar year 1944 (P.L. 229, 78th Cong., 2nd sess.); b) in supplemental and deficiency appropriations made to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946 and 1947, and for part of the fiscal years 1945 and 1948 (P.L. 529, 78th Cong., 2nd sess.; P.L. 269, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; P.L. 521, 79th Cong., 2nd sess.; and P. L. 76, 80th Cong., 1st sess.); c) P.L. 40 (80th Cong.,

<sup>1</sup> This article is drawn largely from a study made by the author entitled: *Farm Wages—A Study in the Determination of Prevailing Wages in Agriculture*. The publication of the latter is expected in the near future. For a discussion of the operations of the State USDA Wage Boards during World War II, see, article by the author on "The Concept and Determination of Prevailing Wages in Agriculture During World War II," *Agricultural History*, 24: 4-18 (Jan. 1950).

The reorganization which followed the passage of Public Law 45 involved the transfer of operational and administrative responsibilities for the Farm Labor Transportation Program from the Farm Security Administration to two other agencies in the Department of Agriculture. The Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service was given the task of mobilizing farm labor within the States and the responsibility for all placement functions affecting local, interstate, and foreign agricultural workers associated with the revised farm labor supply program. A newly created Division of Interstate and Foreign Labor, which later became the Office of Labor within the War Food Administration, was assigned the responsibility of mobilizing farm labor on an interstate basis as well as the functions of recruiting and transporting agricultural workers from near-by foreign countries.

The new legislation permitted "the negotiations of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas." In order to recruit domestic and foreign farm labor, machinery for fixing such wages became necessary.<sup>4</sup> The suggestion to continue the operations of the State USDA Wage Boards within the new organizational set-up was not acted upon. Accordingly, on June 4, 1943, the War Food Administration officially dissolved them and created in their place a system of county wage boards under the immediate supervision of the State farm extension services and under the general direction of the Cooperative Extension Service in Washington. This was accomplished by a letter from the War Food Administration to the State USDA Wage Boards, stating, "Since the State extension services are

responsible for all placement functions incident to the farm labor supply programs, authorized by Public Law 45, 78th Congress, approved on April 29, 1943, it has been decided to establish farm wage boards in each county, with the county agent as chairman, to make recommendations and findings as to prevailing wages which will be needed in carrying on that program. Accordingly, it will no longer be necessary to ask the State Agricultural Wage Boards, established by the Secretary of Agriculture, . . . to make such findings and recommendations."<sup>5</sup>

The county wage board system had two organizational phases. Prior to the official dissolution of the State USDA Wage Boards, a makeshift arrangement was devised by the Extension Service to take over the functions of the State boards. Under this arrangement, prevailing wages were to be ascertained by the County Farm Labor Advisory Committee, or a sub-committee thereof.<sup>6</sup> Its findings were subject to the approval of the county agent. If the workers affected by such findings were recruited from outside the county, but within the State, the findings had to be approved also by the State Extension Director before becoming final. The third link in the chain of approval came into operation when agricultural workers were recruited from outside the State or in a foreign country for employment in a specific county. In that event, the prevailing wage findings had to be confirmed also by the War Food Administrator. In addition, the latter was empowered to designate or approve wage boards, if he deemed it necessary, when a county planned to utilize workers from out of the State or to employ foreign agricultural labor. In this early stage, and to some extent later, these county wage bodies acted only in those areas where prevailing wages had not been determined previously by the State USDA Wage Boards, or in cases where the Extension Service had reason to believe that previous determinations should be reviewed.

Following the liquidation of the State USDA

1st sess.) provided for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the Farm Labor Supply Program at the end of the calendar year 1947, and final administrative liquidation by January 30, 1948.

<sup>4</sup> The same section in the Law (Section 4b) also provided that "no part of the funds herein appropriated . . . for the recruiting, transportation, or replacement of agricultural workers, shall be used . . . to fix, regulate or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country."

<sup>5</sup> Letter, J. L. Taylor, Deputy Administrator, War Food Administration, to Chairman, State USDA Wage Boards, June 4, 1943.

<sup>6</sup> County Farm Labor Advisory Committees were responsible for studying and furnishing advice on all manpower problems in their respective counties. They were semi-official bodies composed of local representatives of agricultural and other governmental agencies as well as of farmers. Many of them were composed mostly of local farmers.



Wage Boards, procedural changes were introduced and operating instructions issued by the Extension Service to State Directors of Extension describing the duties and responsibilities of the County Wage Boards. Organizationally, the County Wage Boards remained practically what they had been from the start, namely, sub-committees of the County Farm Labor Advisory Committee, acting on behalf of the State extension services and the War Food Administration. They were composed of the county agent, who was chairman, and four additional members of the County Farm Labor Advisory Committee appointed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, in contrast to the State USDA Wage Boards, the County Wage Boards were not strictly government bodies. While most of them contained representatives of local governmental agencies, they were composed mostly of local farmers. Some of the County Wage Boards were, in fact, made up entirely of local farmers, with the exception of the county agent.

The basic instruction issued by the Cooperative Extension Service for the purpose of guiding the County Wage Boards in ascertaining and reporting prevailing wages was of a negative character. Rather than defining the term "prevailing wages" positively, it pointed up the consequences should their findings prove to be too low or too high. "It is obvious," the instruction read, "that prevailing wages are neither the lowest nor the highest wages paid a worker in the area. A tendency to set minimum wages instead of going wages will tend to keep farm workers away from such an area. Abnormally high prevailing wages may result in drawing farm labor from another equally important food producing area, or cause farmers to limit production. In the case of foreign workers, it is important that the wage paid over large areas be reasonably comparable in order to avoid a bad situation developing when such labor is moved from one area to another nearby area."<sup>8</sup> In actual practice, the prevailing wage was interpreted to be, as in the case of the State USDA Wage Boards, the most frequent wage paid to farm workers for

the same or similar operations under comparable conditions of employment.

Requests addressed to County Wage Boards for determining prevailing wage rates usually originated with the State Extension Service. Such action was deemed compulsory when the labor needed was to be recruited from out-of-State or foreign sources. When labor was to be recruited within the State, but outside the county of employment, the County Wage Board made such determinations only on direct instructions from the State Extension Director. Upon receipt of a request from the latter for a determination of prevailing rates for particular crops and operations in the county, the county agent arranged for a public hearing in order to receive wage evidence. As in the case of the State USDA Wage Boards, farm operators as well as agricultural workers and other interested persons were invited to testify.

Wage findings were based on the facts assembled at the public hearing as well as on other data reported by special investigating committees appointed by the County Wage Boards. These findings, together with recommendations and a verbatim transcript or summary of the record of the hearing, were transmitted to the State Extension Director for his approval. When prevailing wage rates for farm operations that crossed county lines were reported, which indicated unwarranted or undesirable differences in scales of pay for the same or similar tasks, the findings of each County Wage Board were reconciled by the State Extension Director who issued a blanket area determination. For the most part, however, the Extension Director approved County Wage Boards' findings and recommendations without material changes or modifications. In some States, the State Farm Labor Supervisor, who was both the educational and coordinating agent on the State level for the Cooperative Extension Service under the Farm Labor Supply Program, exercised an over-all advisory and review function over the recommendations of the County Wage Boards.

Upon approval of the State Extension Director, the findings and recommendations of County Wage Boards became official determinations and were forwarded to the Director of the Extension Service in Washington for purposes of information, not for further action. No confirmation of the State Extension Director's action was authorized or required. This was in contrast with the initial and tentative County Wage Board procedure

<sup>7</sup> See, Emergency Farm Labor Circular No. 8, "Determination of Prevailing Farm Wage Rates for the Purpose of Public Law 45, 78th Congress," M. L. Wilson and J. L. Taylor, June 4, 1943.

<sup>8</sup> Memorandum to State Directors of Extension and State Supervisors, Emergency Farm Labor, Meredith C. Wilson, June 4, 1943.

and with the practice that prevailed under the State USDA wage board system.

During the eight months of operation in 1943, about 1,000 County Wage Boards were appointed throughout the United States. They held almost 1,400 hearings and submitted findings on prevailing wages that affected an estimated 330,000 contract workers.<sup>9</sup> In 1945, the peak year of operations, there were over 1,400 County Wage

were contracted for employment under the program. In 1946, the last year of operations, the number of County Wage Boards declined to about 1,100, some 1,300 public hearings were recorded, and an estimated 228,000 workers under contract were affected by wage determinations.<sup>10</sup>

In the course of their experience, the County Wage Boards discovered, as did the State USDA Wage Boards, that the determination of prevailing

*Number of County Wage Boards and Public Hearings Held Under the Farm Labor Supply Program of the Extension Service, by States, 1945*

STATE	NUMBER OF WAGE BOARDS	NUMBER OF PUBLIC HEARINGS	STATE	NUMBER OF WAGE BOARDS	NUMBER OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
United States.....	1430	2401	Nebraska.....	53	63
Alabama.....	33	59	Nevada.....	7	11
Arizona.....	3	0	New Hampshire.....	10	12
Arkansas.....	21	21	New Jersey.....	15	21
California.....	33	69	New Mexico.....	13	31
Colorado.....	31	63	New York.....	33	48
Connecticut.....	8	10	North Carolina.....	61	81
Delaware.....	3	3	North Dakota.....	50	64
Florida.....	18	28	Ohio.....	18	87
Georgia.....	77	163	Oklahoma.....	77	261
Idaho.....	19	25	Oregon.....	11	18
Illinois.....	46	48	Pennsylvania.....	26	37
Indiana.....	42	44	Rhode Island.....	2	2
Iowa.....	50	53	South Carolina.....	33	56
Kansas.....	45	69	South Dakota.....	38	57
Kentucky.....	17	23	Tennessee.....	5	6
Louisiana.....	38	73	Texas.....	101	225
Maine.....	13	26	Utah.....	17	21
Maryland.....	18	37	Vermont.....	9	14
Massachusetts.....	10	14	Virginia.....	48	92
Michigan.....	39	43	Washington.....	9	13
Minnesota.....	28	31	West Virginia.....	10	6
Mississippi.....	53	81	Wisconsin.....	64	97
Missouri.....	42	46	Wyoming.....	12	15
Montana.....	21	34			

Source: Recruitment and Placement Division, Extension Farm Labor Office, Cooperative Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Boards in existence throughout the 48 States. The number of wage boards ranged from two in Rhode Island to 101 in Texas (See accompanying table). That year they held about 2,400 public hearings and ascertained prevailing wage rates affecting an estimated 611,000 farm workers who

agricultural wages was frequently not a simple exercise, and left many problems unsolved. The basic difficulty they faced, particularly in areas employing large numbers of seasonal workers, was that of securing a truly representative cross section of rates which characterized the complex

<sup>9</sup> Contract workers were those who were transported with federal farm labor funds and with whom either the Extension Service or the Office of Labor, W.F.A. signed a work agreement.

<sup>10</sup> Based on data supplied by the Recruitment and Placement Division, Extension Farm Labor Office, Co-operative Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

wage structure in many sections of commercial agriculture. Contributing not a little to this complexity was the prevalence of piece-rate differentials for the same or similar operations, and the attendant difficulty of reconciling and standardizing these differentials. The latter stemmed from different physical conditions in fields and orchards, from varying density of yields and from other wage-influencing factors outside of the workers' control. These factors affected the productivity and earnings of farm wage laborers and for that reason played important roles in prevailing wage determinations, as the earlier State USDA Wage Boards had occasion to experience.

Among other operational problems that most of the County Wage Boards encountered, and which similarly plagued their predecessors, the following were typical: 1) The necessity for making wage findings for operations not yet started, or for those which had not progressed sufficiently to reflect representative prevailing rates; 2) eliciting commitments from employers regarding time-rates they were prepared to pay workers whose capacities and skills were unknown; 3) the problem of keeping up with changes in prevailing rates that occurred during the course of a season and avoiding rigidities in wage scales in the face of changing labor supply and harvesting conditions.

It is to be emphasized that not all County Wage Boards faced these problems in the same degree. Nor were such problems handled with equal resourcefulness and success. Much depended on the quality and background of the wage-board personnel, on their collective sense of responsibility and on special local conditions. These factors, depending upon their character, either accentuated or minimized the willingness, the necessity or the recognition of the importance for ascertaining representative and effective prevailing wages. In the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho and New Jersey, for example, the County Wage Boards and the public wage hearings proved less effective than those in other parts of the country. In these States, particularly, County Wage Boards were closely identified with farm labor (employer) associations or with growers' wage sponsoring committees which fixed the going rates of farm wages.<sup>11</sup> Such wages were readily

accepted as prevailing by the State extension services. The latter, in some cases, followed the practice of holding unofficial meetings with growers at which wages to be paid during the harvest seasons for various jobs were jointly agreed upon. A number of these meetings were held for the purpose of getting farm employers to agree to uniform wages so as to discourage labor pirating and labor turnover, and thus insure continuity of production and help stabilize farm employment. In several counties of the northwestern States, such wage determinations were utilized eventually as a basis for establishing wage ceilings under the Specific Wage Ceiling Program of the War Food Administration.

As a result of such practices and arrangements, however, standard procedures of the County Wage Boards lost much of their significance, particularly the public wage hearing. The State Farm Labor Supervisor in Oregon, for example, observed that "in general, the plan for holding hearings has been a failure. Laborers fail to participate and the results are unbalanced. Field investigations have proven the most satisfactory."<sup>12</sup> In a number of cases, it was not only difficult to get workers to testify, but even employers. Thus in the State of Washington it was reported "that the testimony obtained (at public wage hearings) has little value. Few farmers and less workers attend the sessions and little satisfaction was obtained from holding them."<sup>13</sup> Similarly, in Idaho, the comment was made that "despite the best efforts of the county farm labor program personnel to secure broad representation at prevailing wage hearings, such hearings are attended largely by association members who, after all, are the employers principally interested and affected by the determination of prevailing wages. Difficulty is also experienced in obtaining an adequate number of workers to attend hearings. Very few local workers are engaged in unskilled farm work and volunteer workers are usually not employed at the time the hearings are held. Nevertheless, wage boards were appointed, the hearings were set and duly advertised, and a sincere effort was made to obtain facts on which determinations could be based. The associations regard them merely as a necessary evil and

<sup>11</sup> See, Annual Reports for the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho and New Jersey, 1945, submitted by the State Farm Labor Supervisor to the Cooperative Extension Service.

<sup>12</sup> Annual Report for Oregon, 1945, submitted by the State Farm Labor Supervisor.

<sup>13</sup> Annual Report for State of Washington, 1946, submitted by the State Farm Labor Supervisor.

additional red tape incident to securing transported workers."<sup>14</sup>

Although the foregoing experiences were not infrequent, they were by no means universal. In Michigan, for example, the chairman of a County Wage Board reported that the public hearings conducted by the wage board in his county "did much in helping farmers to determine a fair prevailing wage . . . and had the stabilizing effect of keeping farmers from competitive bidding in attempting to secure labor at a disadvantage of others not financially able to compete for the services of scarce help."<sup>15</sup> Moreover, a number of County Wage Boards in New York and Florida went as far as calling more than one public hearing during the course of a season for purposes of making adjustments in their original wage findings as prevailing rates of pay changed. Even in Idaho,

<sup>14</sup> Annual Report for Idaho, 1945, submitted by the State Farm Labor Supervisor.

<sup>15</sup> Annual Report for Michigan, 1945, submitted by the State Farm Labor Supervisor.

where the value of public hearings proved to be negative, a flexible procedure for adjusting prevailing wage rates in accordance with changing or varying production and employment patterns during the season was adopted within the operating framework of the county wage board system. Several counties in the State established grievance or adjustment committees for this purpose. These committees were composed of representatives of farm employers, the State Extension Service, sugar-beet companies and other interested or affected parties. Their major activities, however, seem to have been confined to assisting the County Wage Boards in making upward adjustments in prevailing piece rates for work performed in fields and orchards where the physical conditions—weedy and muddy soils, heavy brush, hilly topography, etc.—tended to reduce workers' productivity and earnings. These wage-adjustment techniques were important in meeting the demands of the workers, in avoiding or reducing labor-turnover, and in furthering greater utilization of the available labor supply.

## THE DECAY OF AGRICULTURE IN A GROWING ENGLISH INDUSTRIAL REGION: A CASE STUDY

M. J. WISE

*London School of Economics and Political Science*

Interspersed among the factories, foundries, and forges of the Black Country, the industrial complex in the heart of the English Midlands, the modern observer may find patches of grazing-land and even small fields under arable cultivation, which serve as a reminder of the former rural state of this area. Two hundred years ago this was a rural area; against the background of farms, fields, and heathland, an industrial pattern was only beginning to emerge. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the conversion of land from farmland to industrial use became more common. Canals cut farms in half, blast furnaces sprang up, and coal mines developed in fields which, a few months before, had borne their last crops. The coming of the railway in the mid-nineteenth century assisted in the transformation of the scene from a agricultural to an industrial one.

It has been found possible to study the history of a small farm which was engulfed in the industrial development of the nineteenth century and to trace the successive stages in the decline of farming standards and of farm management for which the increasing concentration of industry and of the industrial population was responsible. Particular emphasis has been given to this by recent interest in the lowering of farm standards in Britain caused by extensions of urban and industrial areas.

The farm in question was the Brick House Farm, which lay in the Rowley Regis district of South Staffordshire some two miles south of Dudley and six and one half miles north of Birmingham. The farm formed part of the property of the Trustees of the Estates of St. John's Chapel, Deritend, Birmingham, from whose minute books the suc-



cessive stages of decline can be traced.<sup>1</sup> Favourably situated, with a western aspect, on the slopes of the Rowley Hills, a prominent local feature, the farm possessed, in common with other farms in the district, heavy soils derived from the local Etruria Marl, a heavy red-purplish clay belonging to the Upper Coal Measure series.<sup>2</sup> A hundred yards below the surface, however, lay a number of valuable seams of coal and ironstone. Of especial importance was the presence of the celebrated "Thick" or "Thirty-Foot Seam," a seam of high quality and extraordinary thickness, which was highly sought after and was responsible, more than any other single factor, for the early and successful exploitation of the South Staffordshire coal field.

Farming in this region seems never to have been of an outstandingly high quality, largely no doubt, on account of the heavy nature of the soils. However, during the first quarter of the century the state of Brick House Farm seems to have been of an average standard for the district. The farm comprised some 66 acres, valued in 1830 at a rent of £3 an acre. The leases contained numerous covenants designed to secure a good standard of maintenance with provision for regular manuring and, especially important in this district of clays and heavy soils, adequate drainage. In 1831 the new tenant was required "to drain by furrow soughing at least 10 acres per annum for the first four years." Each field when in fallow was "to be gathered into lands of 5 yards width to facilitate the drainage."

During the early years of the nineteenth century, this district had not been seriously affected by that colliery and industrial development which was rapidly transforming the landscape of other parts of the Black Country. In 1824, however, the mining of coal beneath the Brick House farm began, reflecting, incidentally, the current spread of mining into the Stour valley sector of the coal-field, in which this farm was situated. Before many years had elapsed, the results of the growth in intensity of mining and of the increase in

population of the district had become apparent in the condition of the farm. The reports of visiting Trustees in 1843 and subsequent years make clear the trend of events. Damage to the farm was caused chiefly through mining operations. The subsidence of the surface hollowed and pitted the land, breaking drains, altering watercourses, and making field drainage difficult. In consequence, rushes and sour grasses grew extensively. Spoil-banks ruined the value of the land they occupied and cinders and waste were washed and carried over wider areas, increasing the damage. Though some rebates of rent were made to the tenant in these respects, they did not fully offset the total damage and dislocation caused. Neighbouring industrial and quarrying activities were a further source of nuisance, for spoil from the nearby dolerite quarries<sup>3</sup> extended over some parts of the farm. With the general growth of population, the incidence of trespass greatly increased the damage to crops, gates, and fences. In consequence of these disadvantages a Birmingham surveyor assessed the value of the farm at only £150 a year: but the tenant in 1847 was, in fact, paying £180.

By 1858 the land was described as "in a bad state and excessively poor. From sinking of the surface throughout the colliery, the drains are broken." Subsidence was pronounced and the pitbanks were an increasing obstacle to good farming. In 1865 "crownings in" or sinking of the surface around the mouths of old shafts had rendered some areas useless. Conditions were not such as to encourage good management and difficulty seems to have been experienced in obtaining able and whole-time farmers as tenants. One by-product of the mines was the availability of burnt spoil from pit heaps which had been on fire, and this was said to be a useful fertilizer, large quantities being quarried for that purpose. Attempts were made, with some success at first, to grow early potatoes for the local market.<sup>4</sup> But tenants had little capital to spend on improvements and there was a general reluctance to spend large

<sup>1</sup> Grateful acknowledgment is due to the Trustees, particularly to the Chairman, Mr. T. Ireland, and the Secretary, Mr. W. L. Richardson, for permission to inspect these books.

<sup>2</sup> For a description of this district and of the history of the coal field see B. L. C. Johnson and M. J. Wise, "The Black Country" in *British Association for the Advancement of Science, Birmingham and its Regional Setting* (Birmingham, 1950), 229-249.

<sup>3</sup> The igneous rock, dolerite, which occurs in the Rowley hills has been extensively quarried for use as road metal.

<sup>4</sup> This was not unusual and other references exist to the practice of growing "early potatoes for the London market raised in ground near Dudley, heated by steam and smoke which proceed from an old colliery which has been on fire for some years." *British Parliamentary Papers, Midland Mining Commission, First Report* (S. Staffordshire, 1843), v.

sums of money in reclaiming land which was still liable to subsidence and around which signs of industrial growth were increasing year by year. Some areas became infested with "a noxious weed, red leg."<sup>6</sup> By 1868 as was perhaps to be expected, the quality of management had deteriorated sadly and thistles and weeds bore "silent but forcible testimony to the want of efficient farming." One Josiah Lee had held the farm from 1858-69, of whom it was reported that the land which was "in a most impoverished condition when he took it" was "if possible, in a worse condition when he left it."

The new tenant, William Davis, was only a part-time farmer. He had a supplementary occupation in a local iron-works but he began at a rent now reduced to £100 a year as though he meant to rectify the situation. It was not long, however, before his available capital was well-nigh exhausted and much sterility and waste remained. Trespassing had now become a most serious problem and legal action in the County Courts proved only a partial and expensive answer. The Trustees and their tenant were battling against the whole course of industrial development of the Black Country, for mines, quarries, ironworks and firebrick works with their concomitant workers settlements were growing steadily in this neighbourhood. The reports of the Trustees make no mention of atmospheric pollution but there is ample evidence of the result of this on farm crops and on the natural vegetation from other parts of the Black Country.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, in conditions which would have been marginal in prosperous times, the great Agricultural Depression had also to be faced.

For a time, an experiment in sheep farming, with 60-80 sheep, was carried on, but conditions proved hardly suitable for this purpose especially due to the lack of drainage in most parts of the farm. Crop production, which was only moderate in good years, was negligible in poor ones, and cadlock<sup>7</sup> grew in quantity among the barley and wheat. Gates and fences were in bad repair and subject to

constant damage. The Reports of visiting Trustees make increasingly depressing reading. In 1879 ditches were choked with pit refuse and dust and ashes were encroaching on to the farm. Matters were not helped by "the untidy farming habits of the tenant," which seem to have been responsible for the "slovenly and untidy appearance of the farm." Parts of fields separated by spoilbanks from the main farm had become difficult of access and of little use.

By 1885 the problem had become acute. The farm "still bore the poor and desolate appearance," (this in midsummer) "that it had on the occasion of our last visit." Rain came in, on occasion, through the farmhouse roof, crops were poor and largely intermingled with cadlock. The Trustees were forced again to spend considerable sums on repairs, maintenance and drainage and, with the coal beneath almost worked out, must have considered the farm to be, by this time, almost as much a liability as an asset. They had, however, derived a considerable income from coal royalties. The tenant in 1885 had given notice to quit and was prepared to continue only on condition that the rent was reduced to £75 a year. But in the view of a local observer considering its "impoverished state and the general state of agriculture" the farm was "worth not more than £50 a year"—well under £1 an acre.

In 1886 the Trustees came reluctantly to the conclusion that better returns could be obtained from building than from farm leases and parts of the farm flanking the roads of the district were advertised as for sale in building leases. Some cottages were, in fact, erected, but at a time when the final engulfment of farming by building and industry seemed imminent, a temporary reprieve was granted. Due to the twin causes of exhaustion and flooding of the coal seams, mining activity declined and finally ceased. Neither was there any further large expansion of iron working in the immediate vicinity and the rate of increase of population slackened. So the farm was carried on, managed by men who were part-time farmers, but engaged primarily in the local iron and general metal industries. Surrounded on almost all sides by quarries, ironworks, firebrick works, and other evidences of the industrial age, the standard of farming was not high. More and more houses were built around the farm boundaries. But, stimulated by the demand for food in the first World War, agriculture survived for a time.

<sup>6</sup> Presumably snakeweed (*polygonum bistorta*).

<sup>6</sup> The situation in the 19th century was well described by the local historian F. W. Hackwood, *Odd Chapters in the History of Wednesbury* (1920), 65. "... pit spoil mounds and cinder heaps: with gloomy smoke laden skies and an atmosphere so heavily charged with sulphur and other deleterious exhalations from its myriad groups of chimney stacks that vegetation shrivels, fades slowly and perishes as of blight."

<sup>7</sup> Charlock.

Today the visitor to Brick House Farm will find the farm buildings a mere ruin. The fields and meadows which were tilled and maintained with such pride more than a century ago are now covered with rank grass and reeds while above them stand the abandoned colliery pit heaps. Much of the farm cannot be seen even in this state, for a modern housing estate, erected by the local council, has obliterated even the slightest traces of its former rural character.

This is a story which could be repeated for almost all parts of the Black Country and for many other industrial regions of Britain as well. To take but one example, let us notice the case of the village of Ettingshall, a few miles northwest of Rowley. A report on this village in the early 1840's recorded a diminution of the tithes payable to the rector by nearly one fourth in seven years for the land was now "so much broken up by being undermined and covered with pit banks and iron-

works and buildings."<sup>8</sup> This district had been, thirty years earlier, almost completely agricultural with "hardly a house. . . ." But "the cultivation is transferred from the surface to the interior of the earth and this latter requires many more labourers than the cultivation of the surface and produces much more wealth."

The Black Country today bears many acres of waste land, scarred by pit banks and slagheaps, which were once farmland with histories similar to that of Brick House Farm. Today the grazing of animals and the occasional allotment are, for the most part, the limits of farming activity. But it is still possible to see farming in decline in many areas on the fringe of growing towns and industrial areas, and it is pertinent to wonder whether, in fact, the lessons of Brick House Farm have yet been fully learnt.

<sup>8</sup> Parliamentary Papers, *Midland Mining Commission, First Report*, 50.

## NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

*The Farmers' Movement 1620-1920.* By Carl C. Taylor. (New York: The American Book Company, 1953, vii, 519 p., \$5.50). This "laboratory study of the American Farmers' Movement," as the author terms it, presents a notable undertaking in social methodology and interpretation. We have before us the first systematic attempt to integrate and analyze farmers' combined activities as a unified continuing process. The investigation, based upon recorded statements of organizations and leaders, which are extensively quoted, pertinent monographs, and personal interviews and observations, has extended over a period of thirty-five years during which far-reaching ventures have been made. The changes, in fact, have been so extended and accelerated as to necessitate a second volume for the period since 1920.

Dr. Taylor, as a recognized authority on rural social organization, writes from the point of view of a sociologist but his findings will have a stimulating and challenging interest for economists and historians. His underlying hypothesis, implied throughout, is given definite statement in the conclusion "that, just as the various and varying struggles of laborers arose out of, and have always

revolved about, the issues of wages, hours, and working conditions, and just as all these struggles combined constitute the American labor movement, so the various and varying struggles of farmers arose out of, and have always revolved about, the issues of prices, markets, and credits, and all these struggles combined constitute the American Farmers' Movement."

Inevitably, with the fullest available evidence, in episodes extending over such a long period and involving so great complexities of interests and possible motives there are certain to be differences of opinion as to influences and emphases. For the three hundred years surveyed, the author seems to oversimplify both the terms, "farmers" and "movements." The relative freedom and opportunity of this country has tended to obscure the fact that at all stages there have been disparate elements among cultivators and husbandrymen who have sought from time to time to better their position or raise their status within the occupation. Thus paralleling the struggles between the agricultural and other occupational groups has been that for the protection and improvement of the underprivileged elements. While less intense and

concerted than in the Old World, such internal movements have appeared and persisted from colonial times to the present.

Hence there have been movements concerned not so directly with prices and markets as with land tenure and distribution, political participation, and social standing. Past and current alignments of farmers' organizations as well as the Farm Security policies of the recovery and continuing aid programs give recognition to these intraoccupational disparities and the resulting special grievances.

In drawing upon such an extended and involved mass of historical materials, the risks of inaccuracy are numerous. The following are noted for correction or alteration in a revision. Only in the extractive-trading area of the colonies were the marketable products reduced to forest extractions. Aside from the plantation staples, the grain and meat exports were impressive (8). With the stake of the London merchants in the two-way trade the tobacco planter was by no means dependent "on the chance appearance of English boats" (19). J. B. Turner was connected with Illinois College, not the "University of Illinois" (82n). In view of the wires that he pulled persistently to get and keep jobs in Washington, it is hardly realistic to say that "Father" Kelley was "invited" to join the service (116). The vote in middle western states in 1896 rather than being "closer than usual" was much more decisive than in preceding elections, and North Dakota should be mentioned as another western state lost by Bryan (307).

In view of Hicks' two long chapters on the alliance movement it is hardly fair to conclude that the origins have "never been adequately analyzed." (194).

Even for a highly "selective bibliography" various highly pertinent works should be included. Some of the more obvious are: C. M. Gardner's official history of the Grange; studies of conflicts over agricultural status by J. F. Jameson, T. J. Wertenbaker, Irving Mark, D. M. Ellis, and Henry Christman; J. P. Warren's findings on Shays' uprising and L. D. Baldwin's on the whiskey rebels; J. D. Hicks' informing study of the sub-treasury plan; M. S. Wildman's classic interpretation of frontier inflation and A. S. Tostlebe's judicious appraisal of the Bank of North Dakota; various studies by G. C. Fite, including his biography of Peter Norbeck, contribute both to the periods before and after 1920.

Works of interpretation bearing directly on the subject from various angles are C. M. Destler, *American Radicalism*, T. M. Greer, *American Social Reform Movements*, and R. B. Nye, *Midwestern Progressive Politics*.

With rare appreciation from a fellow discipline, Dr. Taylor confides that the "accounts of historians have been accepted as valid interpretations of facts." Unfortunately, it must be admitted, that there are still many gaps in the facts and basic interpretations that remain to be made. In his pioneer venture in the larger and wider field Dr. Taylor has provided suggestion and stimulation for renewed and extended historical labors. His study of the super-dynamic era from 1920 will thus be awaited by students of all the social disciplines with unusual expectancy.—Earle D. Ross, *Iowa State College*.

*The Embattled Farmers: A Massachusetts Countryside in the American Revolution*. By Lee N. Newcomer. (New York, King's Crown Press, 1953, viii, 274 p., \$3.50).

This book is based on a wide survey of the sources but does not offer much detail, although it does contain a good many interesting anecdotes and provocative generalizations. Two or three of the chapters contain information on the agriculture of western Massachusetts but there is not enough detail to make it a significant economic study. The emphasis is on the whole political, and the approach is narrative rather than analytical.—Merrill Jensen, *University of Wisconsin*.

#### RECENT FAO PUBLICATIONS

The following items published by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations are now available from the Columbia University Press.

*Results of Co-Operative Hybrid Maize Tests in European and Mediterranean Countries, 1950*, a progress report compiled by R. W. Jugenheimer, R. A. Silow and Y. T. Mao (Development Paper No. 31, Rome, 1952, 43 p., \$.50).

*FAO Advisory Assistance to Member Countries under the UNRRA-Transfer Fund*, prepared by Ralph W. Phillips, Truman F. Peebles, W. H. Cummings, and Lena Passerini (Development Paper No. 24, Rome, 1953, 54 p., \$.50).

*Digest of Plant Quarantine Regulations*, prepared by Lee Ling (Development Paper No. 23, New Edition, Rome, 1952, 164 p., \$2.00).

*Tropical Woods and Agricultural Residues as*



*Sources of Pulp*, papers presented at the Fifth Meeting of the FAO Technical Committee on Wood Chemistry, Appleton, Wisconsin, September 1951 (Forestry and Forest Products Studies, No. 3, Rome, 1952, 190 p., \$2.00).

#### REVISTA DE HISTORIA DE AMERICA

The June 1952 issue of the *Revista de Historia de America*, published by the Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, Mexico City, contains four articles devoted to United States history: Thomas C. Cochran, "A New Era in United States History?"; Robert E. Riegel, "Current Ideas of the Significance of the United States Frontier"; Anthony N. B. Garvan, "The Present State of American Studies"; and Waldo G. Leland, "The Historian and the Public in the United States."

#### AMERICAN GRASSES

*The American Grass Book, A Manual of Pasture and Range Practices*, by Sellers G. Archer and Clarence E. Bunch (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1953, 330 p., \$3.95).

#### MAY 1953 MEETING

The Agricultural History Society held a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at the Lafayette Hotel in Lexington, Kentucky, on the afternoon of May 7, 1953. This session was followed immediately by the annual business meeting of the Society.

At the joint session, the theme of which was the change from food gathering to food production, Hugh Cutler of Washington University presented an illustrated lecture of that change as it took place in the New World, while Robert Braidwood presented the story for the Old World. Speaking from the ethnobotanical and anthropological viewpoints respectively, both speakers discussed recently discovered evidence in their fields and both pointed out that much remained to be done. Tom Jones of the University of Minnesota led the interesting discussion that followed the papers. Edward N. Wentworth of Armour's Livestock Bureau served as chairman.

At the business session, called to order by President Edward N. Wentworth at the close of the joint session, Wayne D. Rasmussen, the acting secretary-treasurer, read the minutes of the previous annual meeting and presented a financial statement. Mr. Wentworth reported on the meet-

ing of the Executive Committee held in December 1952. The new membership campaign was discussed by Messrs. Wentworth, Kellar, and Carstensen, and Paul Sharp of Iowa State College was named the chairman of a new membership committee. The proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws, copies of which had previously been sent to all members of the Society, were presented and adopted unanimously.

Mr. Kellar presented the report of the Edwards Memorial Committee, discussing the memorial issue of the journal and a proposal for two fifty-dollar awards each year for the best articles appearing in *Agricultural History*. After some discussion, the recommendation of the committee for the establishment of these awards, to be known as the Everett Eugene Edwards Memorial Awards, was adopted.

Mr. Wentworth announced the appointment of Harold E. Briggs (chairman), Herbert A. Kellar, and Joseph C. Robert to serve as a nominating committee, and of Paul Sharp as program chairman for the 1954 joint sessions with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The meeting concluded with the adoption of a resolution thanking Bennett H. Wall for making arrangements for the meeting, and the adoption of a resolution expressing the deep gratitude of the Society to Charles A. Burmeister for the selfless effort he has given to promoting the interests of the Society.

#### VISITORS TO ITALY

The Institute of Economics and Finance of the University of Rome, Professor Giuseppe Ugo Papi, Director, has asked the Society to inform its members that the Institute would be pleased to assist students visiting Italy or planning to do research work on Italy. The Institute can supply information on both economic and cultural subjects and has a library that is open to visiting scholars.

#### ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS

John P. Harrison of the National Archives discusses "The Archives of United States Diplomatic and Consular Posts in Latin America," in *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 33:168-183 (February 1953). The pertinency of these records to agricultural history is clearly shown in Mr. Harrison's article, "The Evolution of the Colombian Tobacco Trade, to 1875," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 32:163-174 (May 1952).

James C. Malin of the University of Kansas is

the author of "Soil, Animal, and Plant Relations of the Grassland, Historically Reconsidered," *Scientific Monthly*, 76:207-220 (April 1953).

Wayne D. Rasmussen of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is offering a course in the history of American agriculture at American University during the summer of 1953.

Hugh Hill Wooten of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has continued his series of articles on North Carolina with "A Fourth Creek Farm from 1800 to 1830," *North Carolina Historical Review*, 30:167-175 (April 1953).

#### FORD MOTOR COMPANY ARCHIVES

"Rules Governing Use of Ford Motor Company Archives" published as Bulletin Number 2 (Dearborn, Michigan, 1953) sets forth the rules for the use of these materials by non-company researchers. The general policy is set forth as follows: "The resources of the Archives will be available to all individuals who can show that they are qualified to do research and that their inquiry has a serious and important purpose which can be satisfied only through the study of primary materials. Within these requirements, record holdings will be made available under the most liberal policy consistent with accepted archival principles which (a) restrict the use of materials invading the personal privacy of individuals and (b) limit the use of current operating records."

Application for access to inactive records of the Company and the personal papers of Henry Ford should be addressed to the Ford Motor Company Archives, Fairlane, Dearborn, Michigan.

#### THE AMERICAN HISTORY RESEARCH CENTER AWARDS

The American History Research Center of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin has announced the first awards in its nation-wide grant-in-aid program in localized American history. The Center annually makes a series of grants for research and publication in local aspects of American history, in the belief that a knowledge of the details in the American experience is important for a full appreciation of the nation's heritage. Such history points up the vital role played by individuals and local groups in the development of American democracy. Four grants were made in 1953. Two of them will be of interest to members of the Society. Dr. C. Brewster Coulter of the College of Puget Sound has received a grant for research in the history of irrigation in Washington's Yakima Valley, 1880-1926. He is a graduate of Columbia and Princeton Universities and came to the College of Puget Sound from William and Mary College in Virginia.

Dr. Don E. Fehrenbacher, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has received a grant for research on a biography of "Long John" Wentworth, a leader in Chicago during the mid-nineteenth century. Wentworth was editor of the *Chicago Democrat*, twice mayor, a congressman from 1843 to 1855, a pioneer stock breeder, and a sponsor of railroad development. He was one of the early backers of the Chicago Historical Society. Dr. Fehrenbacher holds degrees from Cornell College and the University of Chicago. Next year he will be Acting Assistant Professor at Stanford University.

S  
419  
.A2

## GEORGE CHAFFEY AND THE IRRIGATION FRONTIER

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER, JR.

*Department of History, Ohio University*

Today, few historians have ever heard of George W. Chaffey.<sup>1</sup> Yet his dramatic career deserves their attention both as the record of an outstanding irrigation engineer and for the light it casts upon many less-known aspects of the emergence of twentieth century civilization. Among these aspects are the rapid evolution of the engineering profession, the drawing together of the Pacific World, the spread of American influences overseas, and the clash of politico-economic philosophies—in this case the vigorously individualistic American "Big Business" version of laissez faire versus the nascent welfare state ideology of Australia.

The Chaffey story is not merely an American story—it belongs to the Pacific World. Chaffey's nationality is as elusive as that of Joseph Conrad, James McNeill Whistler or John Paul Jones. Australians usually considered him an American. To Americans he was a Canadian. To Canadians he was a man who had deliberately severed connections with the land of his nativity to bestow his gifts upon faraway places and peoples. Actually, even more than most scientists, he was a citizen of the world, and for him patriotism was always secondary to the joy of achievement.

George W. Chaffey was born of old Somerset Puritan stock at Brockville, Ontario, on January 28, 1848, the eldest of three sons who together represented the third generation of Chaffeys in America. Disrespect for national borders seems to have been a family tradition, for grandfather Benjamin divided his career between the United States and Canada, and father George, Sr., was born in Zanesville, Ohio. As for George, Jr., he was a true son of his era, deeply influenced by the wave of mechanical invention then sweeping the Western world. As with Edison, delicate physical condition is alleged to have put an end to his formal education when barely thirteen, followed, oddly, by a reputation for exceptional physical ruggedness and endurance. The truth is, the lax and classics-dominated school system of the 1860's

repelled most students of a mechanical or scientific bent. Chaffey, like Edison, preferred the shorter route of self-education. Although elected a member of the British Institute of Mechanical Engineers in 1894, Chaffey's engineering knowledge was entirely self-acquired.

His career opened as an apprentice marine engineer on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes. At seventeen young George had invented an improved and more efficient form of screw propeller. By 1875 his *Geneva* was considered the "fastest light draught ship in America," earning a full, front-page article in the *Scientific American*.<sup>2</sup> His growing reputation as a young engineer soon led him to seek the presumably more lucrative markets of the Ohio Valley, where Cincinnati became his headquarters. However, the depression of the late seventies, joined with the doubtful prospects of river steamboats in America, drove him back to Ontario in 1879. That same year he moved to British Columbia, where he designed and served as engineer on several Fraser River steamers.<sup>3</sup> Then in 1880, at the ripe age of 32, he made the pilgrimage to Southern California, where six busy years and the new field of irrigation engineering awaited him.

The reason for this abrupt southward heira is simple. Attracted by reports from the little group of Brockville and Kingston Canadians already well established at Riverside, Chaffey's father had decided in 1878 to retire to that pioneer irrigation colony, accompanied by his two younger sons. Soon a veritable torrent of enthusiastic accounts of the salubrious climate and unparalleled opportunities of California descended upon George, Jr., leading him to pay a more or less casual visit to his

<sup>2</sup> J. A. Alexander, *The Life of George Chaffey: the Story of Irrigation Beginnings in California and Australia* (Melbourne, 1928), 23-27. This biography is extremely useful, although strongly biased in Chaffey's favor. The issue of the *Scientific American* referred to is Vol. 35, No. 17 (October 21, 1876).

<sup>3</sup> No doubt a major factor in his removal to British Columbia was the presence there of his uncle, A. N. Richards, then Lieutenant Governor of the Province.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented before the American Historical Association, Pacific Coast Branch, at Vancouver, British Columbia, on December 28, 1952.

father during the winter of 1880. He was so charmed by the region, however, that he decided not to return to British Columbia at all. Instead he joined forces with his brother William, who had already acquired some knowledge of citrus farming, and the firm of Chaffey Brothers was born.

The action was timely. Hardly a more favorable moment in the development of Californian irrigation could have been chosen, even by design. The solid success of Riverside, now beyond dispute, had convinced the public of the practicality of agriculture by irrigation methods. Irrigation projects were regarded as simple affairs; it was assumed that any willing worker could become a successful irrigator, and that all soils would produce bountifully, once water was made available. Capital was easy to obtain, and engineering knowledge was at a premium. All development lay in the hands of private enterprise, for the Federal Government at this time neither desired nor was desired to play any role but that of benevolent bystander. As yet the most likely regions of potential development had not been touched. It was a situation made to order for a vigorous, imaginative young man like Chaffey.

He made the most of it. Soon he became a fast friend of L. M. Holt, editor of the *Riverside Press and Horticulturalist* and the leading irrigation journalist in the state. Since many of Holt's ideas were put into effect by Chaffey, the latter could usually count upon a favorable press. Between 1881 and 1882 he organized and built two irrigation enterprises, the colonies of Etiwanda and Ontario. Of these Ontario was much the larger and more important, in due time earning the title of "the Model Colony." Its broad streets, its College of Education, its unique "gravity tram" and its many improvements all added luster to Chaffey's reputation.<sup>4</sup>

In the process of building Ontario, Chaffey had learned a great deal about the promotion and even more about the technological aspects of irrigation colonies. He also made important discoveries of

<sup>4</sup> The names of both colonies were drawn from Chaffey's boyhood in Canada, Etiwanda being the name of an Indian chief who was a great friend of his uncle. In 1904 Ontario was selected as the subject for a model American citrus colony display at the St. Louis World's Fair. "Ontario," *The Land of Sunshine*, 3: 247-250 (October, 1895); Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 34-56. At an early time Ontario assumed membership in that countless host of spots which raises the best lemons in California.

his own. According to Elwood Mead, Chaffey, with Holt, first devised the mutual irrigation company idea which is still the dominant type of private irrigation enterprise in the Southwest; Chaffey was "first in Western America to combine hydro-electric development with irrigation," thus providing future irrigation planners with their principal cash "crop;" and Chaffey first introduced into general use the practice of lined irrigation works and pipe lines to convey water under pressure.<sup>5</sup> He was a pioneer in electric lighting and long distance telephone installation in California.<sup>6</sup> An intriguing feature of Ontario was that the sale of liquor was banned, due to Chaffey's belief that this would encourage habits of thrift and industry, and promote the success of the colony.

At this juncture there suddenly appeared in California a youthful but already distinguished stranger. Alfred Deakin, known today as one of the principal architects of the Australian Commonwealth, was then on the first rung of the ladder of success. The purpose of his presence in America, heading a Victorian Royal Commission, was to study American irrigation practices. Ever since 1870 a few Australian irrigation enthusiasts had called attention to developments in the United States; Deakin gave to this movement the leadership it had previously lacked.<sup>7</sup> The parallels of climate, soil and rainfall which he observed during

<sup>5</sup> Introduction by Elwood Mead in Alexander, *George Chaffey*, xiii; Orson W. Israelson, *Irrigation Principles and Practices* (New York, 1950), 361-362. The virtual impossibility of proving "firsts" in the history of science is well known. Mead's unsupported word, while certainly not adequate proof of originality, does show how Mead felt about Chaffey's role in crystallizing a grass roots trend into solid usable form.

<sup>6</sup> Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 38-40. Chaffey had met Alexander Graham Bell on the occasion of his original demonstration of the telephone at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition of 1876.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 74-80; "The Australian Irrigation Colonies," *All the Year Round*, 70: 172-176 (February 20, 1892); Alfred Deakin, *Irrigation in Western America, So Far as it has Relations to the Circumstances of Victoria* (Melbourne, 1885), 5-12; Sir Charles Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain* (London, 1890), 123-125. Among those who strongly supported investigating American irrigation were David Syme, Australia's most influential newspaper publisher, and Hugh McColl, the "father" of Victorian irrigation. Ambrose Pratt, *David Syme, the Father of Protection in Australia* (London and Melbourne, 1908), 221-222; James H. McColl, "Hugh McColl and the Water Question in Northern Victoria," *Victorian Historical Magazine*, 5: 145-163 (June, 1917).



his whirlwind, three-month tour of Western America further convinced Deakin that no other part of the world was so perfectly adapted to serve as a model for Australia. Among the many spots which he visited was the Ontario colony.<sup>8</sup>

Just why the Chaffey family decided to abandon a highly successful career in California for the doubtful possibilities of interior Australia is not altogether clear.<sup>9</sup> Among the suggested reasons are Deakin's salesmanship, the entrepreneurial itch which so incurably affected Chaffey all his life, the highly romanticized picture of Australia which Chaffey received from the adventurer, Stephen Cureton, whom he met at Bakersfield just following Deakin's visit, a sense of Imperial patriotism, and pure chance. Probably each of these played its part.<sup>10</sup> At any rate, by the spring of 1886 both George and William Chaffey were in Melbourne, having disposed of their American interests at a fraction of their real worth.

It would be a gross error to credit Chaffey with introducing the idea of irrigation to Australia.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 79-89; Deakin, *Irrigation in Western America*, 24-29, 101-102; George J. Evatt, "The Development of Irrigation, with Special Reference to New South Wales," *Journal of the Institute of Public Administration, New South Wales Regional Group*, 1 (2): 16-31 (March, 1938); Walter Murdoch, *Alfred Deakin: a Sketch* (London, 1923), 88-96. Despite the hasty nature of his trip, Deakin's report was good enough to be republished as a U. S. Government document a few years later.

<sup>9</sup> Typical of the prevailing American attitude is the brief and unfavorable editorial comment in *Science*, 6: 551-552 (December 25, 1885).

<sup>10</sup> Although Deakin is strangely reticent in his written report, he later claimed to have been strongly impressed by the Chaffey family. Certainly no invitation was extended by Deakin, although his persuasive tongue was undoubtedly active. It would appear that a half-joking remark by E. S. Cunningham, editor of the Melbourne *Argus* and a member of the mission, to the effect that Australia needed someone like Chaffey to show them how to build irrigation colonies, stuck in the minds of both the Chaffey brothers. Cabled inquiries later on brought favorable responses from Deakin. Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 89-105; Deakin, *Irrigation in Western America*, 96-97, 115; A. S. Kenyon, "The Story of the Mallee," *Victorian Historical Magazine*, 4: 193 (1914-1915).

<sup>11</sup> Examples of small-scale local irrigation in Australia may be traced back as far as 1828. However, none of them amounted to much, and even these looked to California for inspiration, at least from the 1870's, and possibly from the 1850's, onward. For instances of early irrigation see McColl, "Hugh McColl and the Water

What he did was to introduce modern, large-scale, irrigation engineering methods by means of which apparent deserts could be made to blossom. This is quite in keeping with the general role which America has played in the history of science; our contribution has usually been one of original technology rather than of original basic concepts. But one can hardly afford to take original technology lightly. In democratic societies, empirical and instrumentalist in attitude and based upon majority consent, it is colorful technological applications which impress the average citizen and provide him with the milestones by which he judges the progress of science. Such was the case with irrigation in Australia; the technological application was Chaffey's colony at Mildura.

Certainly the site which Chaffey selected seemed most unfavorable—on the Murray River, it is true, but far away in the northwest corner of the state in the heart of the hideously barren mallee country. Contemporaries termed it a "hissing Sahara!"<sup>12</sup> Here Chaffey set about erecting a new

Question," *Victorian Historical Magazine*, 5: 145-163; "Historical Notes and Queries," Royal Australian Historical Society, *Journal and Proceedings*, 34: 386-387 (1948); Nehemiah Bartley, *Opals and Agates; or Scenes Under the Southern Cross and the Magellans: Being memoirs of fifty years of Australia and Polynesia* (Brisbane, 1892), 62-63; *Journal of the Department of Agriculture of Victoria, Australia*, 10: 658-661 (November 11, 1912). For examples of American influence before 1885 see F. B. Gipps, "On the Importance of a Comprehensive Scheme of Water Storage and Canalization for the Future Welfare of this Colony," Royal Society of New South Wales, *Journal*, 15: 320-326 (1881); A. S. Kenyon, "Stuart Murray and Irrigation in Victoria," *Victorian Historical Magazine*, 10: 113-117 (June, 1925); *Victorian Review*, 5: 13-27, 381-397 (November 1, 1881; February 1, 1882); 7: 50"-517 (March 1, 1883); 8: 477-489 (August 1, 1883).

<sup>12</sup> Illusions concerning the future of the Mallee existed neither in England nor in Australia. "Australian Irrigation Colonies," 172; Evatt, "Development of Irrigation in N.S.W.," 17; Kenyon, "Story of the Mallee," 175-177. From page 183 of the latter comes the following description of the Mallee country, penned originally by "Telemachus" (Francis Myers) of the Melbourne *Argus*: "It is a country that people generally know very little about, that nobody has done much good with, that has broken the backs of many men, the hearts of not a few; that contains the skeleton and the ugly ghosts of many a bright dream. It is haunted by the spirit of the heritage of our desolation; it is endurable only to those who love the wilderness, or who dauntlessly labour for its redemption. It was through many years an absolute *terra incognita*; a

Ontario—the same town plan, the same social ideals, including prohibition, the same mutual irrigation company scheme to distribute water on a non-profit basis, the same emphasis upon agricultural education. There were also some new and ingenious engineering devices for lifting the water to the ninety foot elevation above the river on which Mildura was situated.<sup>13</sup> By 1889 the colony was booming—and producing, also. Its success led Chaffey to branch out into new irrigation projects in Victoria and New South Wales; he had 'already undertaken the Renmark colony in nearby South Australia.

For two years the Chaffey enterprises flourished. Then in 1891 the twelve-year-old Victorian land boom suddenly collapsed, precipitating a financial panic which broadened into the worst depression in Australian history; the great Bank Smash of 1893 was its culmination. In such an economic maelstrom the infant irrigation colonies were particularly vulnerable. Yet Chaffey fought off bankruptcy for two additional years, while the oldest and soundest banks were toppling all about him. In the end, however, it was the revolt of his

wilderness of dull green leaves, of ragged brown stalks, seeming to afford nothing more nutritious or useful than the arid soil which produces them. They are too stiff to pass wave-like to any wind that may pass over and through them, nor under any circumstances do they yield any music or pleasant forest sounds. There is a dry sort of rustle, like the inarticulate murmur of many parched tongues, from the leaves, and the innumerable strips and shreds of dead bark beat against the stems like the wasting garments against the bones of a gibbet. The broad wing of an eagle is frequently seen against the dismal earth garment or the glorious blue of the sky, and black crows are frequent, their croaks according well with the eerie rustle of bark shreds.' "

<sup>13</sup> Chaffey quickly found that surface ditches or sub-surface pipes were equally impossible at Mildura, hence the pumps. "For the first time in engineering history, direct-acting triple expansion engines were to be used for driving centrifugal pumps." The engines had to be placed on special order in England, where they caused a furor; Tangye's, Ltd., would make the machine only on condition that the firm's name not be placed on it. Later Tangye himself made a trip to Mildura to see the engines work, and was well pleased with their performance. The machine was still actually in use in 1928. Also "the split case principle was introduced for the first time in Australia in these pumps at Psyche Bend and Billabong Stations." Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 164-166.

own settlers that ruined him, even more than the depression itself. At this moment when the solvency of the colony hung by a thread, a group of disaffected farmers assailed Chaffey with violent charges of mismanagement and exploitation. The final stroke of doom was sounded on May 12, 1896, when the Victorian Government recognized these complaints by appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the situation. Mildura was virtually in receivership.

From the very first, there had been political troubles. The scrupulously correct behavior of Deakin did not save him from being linked by his opponents with this "cute" Yankee foreigner in a vile plot to give away the country's landed birth-right. While times were good, few took these denunciations seriously. But after the crash, it was the foes of Mildura who were appointed to the Royal Commission. Their verdict was an indictment of everything the Chaffeys had done since coming to Australia, although in its findings the Royal Commission ran counter to the testimony of the qualified expert engineers and permanent civil servants directly concerned with the project. In any case the report completely ruined Chaffey's career in Australia. Bankruptcy followed, and he had to borrow money for his passage back to the United States.<sup>14</sup>

Why did Chaffey fail to make a financial success at Mildura? Over and beyond the obvious fact of the depression of the 1890's, there are certain reasons which emerge with clarity from the welter of accusation and counter-accusation. Certainly there can be no doubt that Chaffey badly over-extended himself from the first. Mildura was many times the area of Ontario, and more complex; yet to it were successively added Renmark in South Australia, the Weribee project near Melbourne, the Mulgoa scheme in New South Wales, negotiations for another irrigation colony with the Queensland Government, and a private engineering partnership in Melbourne. It was too much for one man to handle, and on a financial shoestring at that. Yet Chaffey was an entrepreneur. He merely followed his entrepreneurial instincts, and did as hundreds of other entrepreneurs had been doing so successfully in post-Civil War America—as Chaffey

<sup>14</sup> Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 168-186, 225-245; R. W. Dale, "Impressions of Australia," *Contemporary Review*, 54: 850-855 (December, 1888); C. Brunson Fletcher, *Water Magic: Australia and the Future* (Sydney, 1945), 48-49; Kenyon, "Story of the Mallee," 4: 195-197.

himself had done at Ontario and Etiwanda. To a winner, gambling seldom seems to be a vice!

More subtle, and therefore more deadly, was the undercurrent of anti-American sentiment which existed in many Australian circles during the 1880's. This was the decade when Australian nationalism made the choice between dominion status under Great Britain, or separatism and independence on the American model. The separatist movement, which was quite vocal, caused many loyal English colonials to regard Americans as a threat to "the scarlet thread of kinship" which bound them to the motherland. Hence it was easy to accuse Chaffey of Yankee craft and greed. Such anti-American undertones lent special virulence to the political attacks upon Mildura.<sup>15</sup>

Chaffey always overestimated the exactness of the parallel between Australia and America. Thus he confidently used the unlined irrigation channels familiar in California, only to be plagued with salting and excessive seepage. Ultimately the cause was discovered—the "yabbies," tiny crayfish unknown to America which burrowed one hundred feet or more. But in the meantime Chaffey's enemies made the most of it. More important still was the failure to assure the marketing of the wine and fruit product. Apparently Chaffey assumed that Australia, like America, possessed an insatiable domestic market. But Australia had barely 3,000,000 people in 1890. Under depression conditions Mildura was producing more than Australia could absorb, and the nearest foreign markets were half a world away.<sup>16</sup>

Another stumbling block was the settlers themselves, a mixed lot from all parts of the globe, most of them totally lacking in farming experience. The largest group was from England, and easily grew

discouraged with the strange and difficult land.

The native Australian farmers showed a marked strain of conservatism, stubbornly preferring wheat to fruit culture which they regarded as an effeminate fad. When the ridiculous report circulated that settlers were entitled to free water from the Chaffey Brothers, many seized upon this as a solution to their problems. Presently a large faction was devoting its time to fighting the Chaffey's, whom it succeeded in ruining, and very nearly the colony as well.<sup>17</sup>

Perhaps most important of all was the extent to which Australian national ideology had diverged from the Anglo-American pattern of economic individualism. The political insecurity of Victoria during the 1880's reflected this; both current parties had outlived their original issues, and were rapidly drifting away from laissez faire toward stop-gap government aid and piece-meal government ownership, what a French observer in 1900 called "le socialisme sans doctrines." It was this situation into which the Chaffey's walked in 1886—disillusionment with private enterprise, lip service still being paid to it, and a rising tide of welfare state sentiment. Yet, the very real anxiety of Australians to develop irrigation as a new form of industry which would render the country less dependent upon wheat and wool further blinded Chaffey to what he did not wish to see anyway.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> A qualified and characteristically American view on this point is expressed by William Ellsworth Smythe, *Conquest of Arid America* (1st. ed., New York and London, 1900), 289; "The experience of the Chaffey Brothers, of California, who went to Australia to found colonies at the request of the government was quite similar [in showing the need for following experienced leadership]. As long as the people worked upon plans the projectors had learned from their valuable experience in California, and accepted direction, they prospered. When the people took full control for themselves, dissension and demoralization quickly ensued, to be followed by disappointment, and at least partial defeat." See also Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 172-173, 190-196 and introduction (Elwood Mead) xiv; Dale, "Impressions of Australia," 855; Kenyon, "Story of the Mallee," 196-197.

<sup>18</sup> S. M. Ingham, "Political Parties in the Victorian Legislative Assembly, 1880-1900," *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, 4: 241-256 (November, 1950); Dale, "Impressions of Australia," 842; Albert Metin, *Législation Ouvrière et Sociale en Australie et Nouvelle-Zélande* (Paris, 1901) as cited in Brian Fitzpatrick, *The British Empire in Australia: an Economic History, 1834-1939* (Melbourne, 1941), 272-275.

<sup>15</sup> Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 194-195; Royal Society of New South Wales, *Journal and Proceedings*, 17: 146 (1883). For examples of Australian separatism see Dilke, *Greater Britain*; Robert Thomson, *Australian Nationalism; an Earnest Appeal to the Sons of Australia in Favor of the Federation and Independence of the States of our Country* . . . (Burwood, N.S.W., 1888); Henry L. Hall, *Australia and England: A Study in Imperial Relations* (London, 1934).

<sup>18</sup> Stuart Murray, probably the most competent irrigation engineer in Victoria, raised the question of marketing in 1890. The problem was not solved until much later when W. B. Chaffey helped found the Australian Dried Fruits Association. Kenyon, "Stuart Murray and Irrigation in Victoria," 112-122; Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 181-182, 196-200; A. D. Lewis, *Irrigation in Australia* (Pretoria, 1935), 50-51.



Certainly he should have been warned by the extreme reluctance of Australians, whether friendly or hostile, to part with the land grants which he confidently anticipated in return for his irrigation improvements and railroads. But the entrepreneurial lust to be doing things made him disdain the caution suggested by such storm warnings.<sup>19</sup>

Despite its financial failure, Mildura was in every other respect the most important success in Australian irrigation history.<sup>20</sup> The verdict of the Royal Commission did not outlast the decade, and it was to be succeeded by a chorus of praise from all sides, regardless of party. Mildura-Renmark was the model from which all later Australian irrigation colonies consciously proceeded—Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia—wherever irrigation was seriously considered.<sup>21</sup> The judgment of history is

<sup>19</sup> For example, back in 1883 McColl said, "... that private individuals in the United States had been given powers over irrigation 'which this colony would never dream of.'" Alfred Deakin in his report had expressed surprise at United States governmental indifference to the construction of railroads, telegraph and water supply, and had disapproved of it. Ingham, "Political Parties," 251; Deakin, *Irrigation in Western America*, 12-14; Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 89-90, 104-105, 114-115.

<sup>20</sup> Mr. R. Scobie, M. L. A. from The Murray, New South Wales, put it almost in those words: "In regard to Mildura, which, so far, he acknowledged, had been a financial frost, there was no doubt that it had been a splendid irrigation success." New South Wales Conference on Water Conservation and Irrigation, *Report Containing Minutes of Proceedings and Debates* ... (Sydney, 1905), 87.

<sup>21</sup> For Victoria see Kenyon, "Story of the Mallee," 175-200; and the statement of Lewis R. East, Chairman, State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, Victoria, in Gordon Leslie Wood, ed., *Australia, Its Resources and Development* (New York, 1949), 169. For New South Wales see T. A. Brassey, "Water in Australian Saharas," *Little's Living Age*, 187: 43-49 (1890); and T. H. Houghton, Presidential address, Royal Society of New South Wales, *Journal and Proceedings*, 51: 54-57 (1917). For South Australia see Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 145-146, 247-257; Institute of Engineers, Australia, *Transactions*, 3: 74-91 (1922). For Queensland, *ibid.*, 164-172; and the pamphlet, J. Bailey Brown, *Second Chapter of Revelations: Practical and Practicable Suggestions on Land Settlement, Irrigation, Crops and Industries which will build up the colony* (Brisbane, 1891). For Western Australia, Hugh Oldham and J. F. Moody, *Irrigation and Water Conservation in Western Australia* (Perth, 1913), 5-35.

clear today; Mildura marks the beginning of effective irrigation enterprise in Australia.<sup>22</sup>

But all this was too late to help Chaffey, who returned to America, penniless and dispirited, in the summer of 1897.<sup>23</sup> After a year of working the bad taste of Mildura from his mouth by railroad promotion work in Florida and Texas, he returned to California in time to participate actively in the third of the great engineering enterprises of his life, the development of the Imperial Valley.

Once before in his early California period Chaffey had been approached with a scheme for irrigating the Colorado Desert by Dr. O. M. Wozencraft. He had rejected it then on the grounds that despite its appeal as an engineering enterprise, white farmers were not physically able to work in sustained temperatures of 110° Fahrenheit or more. But Mildura with its 125° maximum shade temperature had changed his mind. Thus when young Charles R. Rockwood came to Chaffey with a desperate appeal for financial aid to revive his almost bankrupt California Development Company, the older man was immediately interested. The scope and daring of the project appealed to him irresistibly, and he consulted his wealthy, Los Angeles banker son, Benjamin Chaffey, about financial assistance. Warned that the Rockwood group was composed of slippery promoters, Chaffey brushed aside his son's objections with the plea, "Let me do one more big thing before I die!"

So in spite of qualms, Chaffey signed a contract with the California Development Company by which he provided \$100,000—apparently most of the cash which that elusive concern possessed—

<sup>22</sup> The testimony is legion. From among many, both contemporary and more recent, may be cited *Australian Builder and Constructor's News* (Sydney), 2: 203 (March 31, 1888); Minister of Public Works, C. A. Lee, in N.S.W. Conference on Water Conservation and Irrigation, *Report*, (1905), 5-6; two Australian Prime Ministers, Alfred Deakin in 1907 and Stanley M. Bruce in 1928, quoted in Alexander, *George Chaffey*, vii-viii, 363; Sir Littleton Groom in [Jessie Jane Groom], *Nation Building in Australia: the Life and Work of Sir Littleton Ernest Groom, K.C.M.G., K.C., M.A., L.L.M., M.P.* (Sydney, 1941), 138; Commissioner H. H. Dare, *Water Conservation in Australia* (Sydney, 1939), 3, 25; and the former editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, C. Brunson Fletcher, *Water Magic*, 48-49.

<sup>23</sup> George's brother, W. B. Chaffey, stuck it out in the irrigation area, where he became known as "the Grand Old Man of Mildura."



and new engineering plans which in Chaffey's opinion made the scheme workable. The original diversion canal from the Colorado through the dry bed of the Alamo River in Mexico via the Chaffey Gate was conceived and built by him.

But his most brilliant coup was one of nomenclature. Chaffey realized instantly that the old name would not do; the chance to emigrate to a desolate waste possessing the most evil reputation in America was not likely to attract many settlers. Accordingly, one of his first acts was to decree that the Colorado Desert would henceforth be known as the Imperial Valley. Obviously Chaffey was relying heavily upon the geographical ignorance of most Americans; his trust was not misplaced. Expert promotion along the lines developed at Mildura brought to this new farmers' El Dorado a flood of applicants so large that the ability of the land company to provide them with irrigable plots was taxed to the utmost.

No sooner was the Imperial Valley in successful operation, however, than Rockwood began to devote his energies to ousting Chaffey. In 1902 he succeeded through stock manipulations in forcing Chaffey's withdrawal from the management after a dispute which was full of recrimination and bad feeling. Rockwood then altered the Chaffey plans, building a new intake further to the south, in Mexico, and without a headgate. The result was the famous breakthrough of the Colorado River which threatened to create an inland freshwater sea equal in size to the Great Salt Lake. The waters were turned back only by the combined efforts of E. H. Harriman and his engineers Epes Randolph and Henry T. Cory.<sup>24</sup> With the successful establishment of Imperial Valley, Chaffey's engineering

career was virtually at an end.<sup>25</sup> In 1917, he abandoned active business altogether, dividing his retirement between Southern California and Canada.

Today, Chaffey's name and contribution are scarcely known to American historians. Why? Certainly not through failure to merit attention. It would appear, rather, that there is little conception of the role and importance of the rise of irrigation and conservation in our national life. To date the history of American irrigation has not been written.<sup>26</sup> What we have instead is a history of irrigation legislation, a history far removed from the lives and views of the farmers whose fate it describes, a nameless history lacking either heroes or villains. This kind of history can neither appeal to the curiosity nor illuminate the understanding.

Behind this paucity of writing is a failure to understand the relationship of irrigation to the frontier epic. For the idea that 1890 marked "the closing of a great historic movement" was an Eastern idea—or Middle-Western, at best—the view of a section which never understood the West well, and wept no tears of sorrow at the idea of laying it in its grave.<sup>27</sup> The West itself felt rather that 1890 marked the beginning of the fourth and final stage of the frontier process—the

<sup>24</sup> Apart from a legal clash with the City of Los Angeles over water rights in the Owens River Valley in 1905, and a verbal tussle with the redoubtable "T. R." over the role of private enterprise in conservation, he did nothing additional that was of public interest.

<sup>25</sup> This is true despite the fine contributions of John T. Gano of the University of Oregon, Everett W. Sterling and a few others. However, several valuable biographies have recently appeared, including Robert Shankland, *Steve Mather of the National Parks* (New York, 1951); Andrew Denny Rogers, *Bernhard Eduard Fernow, a Story of North American Forestry* (Princeton, 1951); William Culp Darrah, *Powell of the Colorado* (Princeton, 1951).

<sup>27</sup> For example, the very meaning of the word "irrigation" was different to Easterner and Westerner. In the East a farmer "irrigated" transplanted plants, and a city dweller "irrigated" the lawn; but a Westerner irrigated his entire farm. Henry J. Philpott, "Irrigation of Arid Lands," *Popular Science Monthly*, 36: 364-365 (January, 1890). In 1888 the *Nation* declared that Colorado had by far the largest irrigable area in the West and was destined by Nature's ordinance to dominate all such activity in that region. *Nation*, 47: 390-391 (November 15, 1888).

<sup>24</sup> It is a matter of regret that a definitive history of the Imperial Valley has not appeared. The most recent effort is *The Colorado Conquest* (New York, 1941) by David O. Woodbury, a resident of Brawley, California. This work has the advantages of local acquaintance and interviews with key figures. However, it is marred by imaginary conversations between hypothetical settlers which add journalistic spice but make it often impossible to distinguish fact from fiction. Chaffey is dealt with sympathetically on pages 60-77 and 272-273. Also useful is George Kennan, *E. H. Harriman: a Biography* (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1922), 2: 88-173; these pages have been separately printed by the same author as *The Salton Sea: an Account of Harriman's Fight with the Colorado River* (New York, 1917). Chaffey's role is adequately traced in Alexander, *George Chaffey*, 269-339.

conquest of the arid lands which were the nation's last agricultural heritage.<sup>28</sup> And the feeling was a strong one. When Major Powell's action seemed to stand in the way of private irrigation development, Westerners denounced him bitterly as a "power-mad" conservative, opening a controversy which led to his resignation in 1894.<sup>29</sup> Elwood Mead argued in 1902 that irrigation was an integral part of the future westward movement in the United States; "the homestead of the future," he said, "must be irrigated."<sup>30</sup>

The leaders in this "postscript frontier" were neither Indian fighters nor politicians. Instead they intended increasingly to be men of considerable scientific knowledge and administrative capacity—Judge North, Major Powell, Luther Burbank, William E. Smythe, L. M. Holt, George Chaffey and Elwood Mead. Of this group Chaffey was the first to apply engineering skill directly to irrigation. He was also one of the West's first notable agricultural engineers. Indeed, the American Society of Agricultural Engineers was not organized until 1907.<sup>31</sup>

Another important aspect of Chaffey's career is the role he played in disseminating American influences abroad.<sup>32</sup> In the latter half of the nineteenth century the advancing power and maturity

of the United States was accompanied by a sharp upswing in her cultural exports overseas. The overwhelming technological flavor of that culture was the most obvious feature of what might be called the "Expansion of American Civilization," and its most effective missionaries were engineers and business representatives of industry. The career of Chaffey affords a perfect example, at least in respect to Australia, of how this process went on despite squabbles abroad and almost complete ignorance at home of what was transpiring. Thus Chaffey might set sail from Australia bankrupt and a failure, but his engineering ideas remained and triumphed, almost without a struggle.

Finally the story of Mildura and its founder provides one of the early episodes in that drawing together of the Pacific World which has been such a remarkable feature of our century. When Albert Beveridge, speaking in a less noble cause, described the broad Pacific as an ocean which "joins us, a river never to be dredged, a canal never to be repaired," he spoke more truly than he knew. Even before Mildura was completed, there were prophecies that Great Britain might adopt Chaffey's colony system of settlement in place of individual emigration for other parts of the Empire.<sup>33</sup> In 1894 Smythe stressed the new "Triple Alliance" of the United States, Mexico and Canada in irrigation matters.<sup>34</sup> And in 1922 Elwood Mead described to the Pan-Pacific Scientific Congress how the modern system of government-organized, financed and assisted irrigation settlement had originated in Australia, then had been brought to Canada by the Canadian Pacific Railway for its Calgary irrigation project, and finally had been borrowed by California for its Land Settlement Act of 1917.<sup>35</sup> In fact the community of interests and problems in the Pacific World has continued to draw its members into an ever closer and more amicable fraternity since the days of that pioneer entrepreneur and international engineer, George Chaffey.

<sup>28</sup> Dale, "Impressions of Australia," 854-855.

<sup>34</sup> William E. Smythe, "The Progress of Irrigation Thought in the West," *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, 10: 400 (October, 1894).

<sup>35</sup> *Proceedings of the Pan-Pacific Science Congress*, 1923, (Melbourne, 1924), 1: 58-60.

<sup>28</sup> See William E. Smythe, "The Irrigation Idea and its Coming Congress," *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, 8: 396 (October, 1893); Smythe, "The Conquest of Arid America," *Century Magazine*, 28: 86, 90 (May, 1895).

<sup>29</sup> Everett W. Sterling, "The Powell Irrigation Survey, 1888-1893," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 27: 421-434 (December, 1940).

<sup>30</sup> Elwood Mead, "Problems of Irrigation Legislation," *Forum*, 32: 573 (January, 1902); Mead, "Making the American Desert Bloom," *Current History*, 31: 123 (October, 1929).

<sup>31</sup> For brief background discussions of irrigation and agricultural engineering see James Kip Finch, *Engineering and Western Civilization* (New York, 1951), 252-261; John G. McGuire and Howard W. Barlow, *An Introduction to the Engineering Profession* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), 30-33.

<sup>32</sup> The study of American Influences has attracted considerable attention of late. See Richard H. Heindel, ed., *American Influences Abroad: an Exploration*, (New York, 1950), and bibliography included in papers delivered before the American Historical Association in Boston, December 30, 1949. Issued by Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in pamphlet form.

## EBENEZER PETTIGREW'S EFFORTS TO CONTROL THE MARKETING OF HIS CROPS

BENNETT H. WALL

*Department of History, University of Kentucky*

Ebenezer Pettigrew, planter of Washington and Tyrrell counties, North Carolina, owned two plantations that produced sizeable quantities of corn and wheat.<sup>1</sup> His labor force consisted of approximately seventy-five slaves. His plantations were models of efficiency and production, and he was reputed the most scientific farmer in that region.

Ebenezer and his father, Charles, dealt with factors or commission merchants for approximately seventy-five years. They came to appreciate the problems of this group and enjoyed remarkably good business relationships with them. However, both the planters and factors experienced constant difficulty with the shipowners and captains. Since Pettigrew lived in the tidewater region of North Carolina, he was completely at the mercy of carriers upon whom he depended to transport his crops. Despite good crop years, the heavy charges for hauling staple crops and supplies to and from towns, coupled with fixed port charges, inexorably cut into his profits. In most cases planters merely complained, but Ebenezer Pettigrew, after long and bitter experiences in dealing with the carriers, sought to eliminate this middleman. That he ultimately failed in no way detracts from his vision.

In his first twenty-five years as a planter, Pettigrew found himself in a disadvantageous position both in marketing crops and in purchasing supplies. Although he had contacts with commission houses in New York, Richmond, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Charleston, Baltimore, Providence, and Norfolk, he did not have direct shipping contacts. Wheat, rice, and corn could be picked up by outgoing vessels at the mouth of his Batavia (Bonarva) Canal, but because of delay in obtaining vessels they were frequently flatboated to the Scuppernong River, hauled by longboat to Edenton, stored, and transferred to vessels as they became available.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A portion of this research was made possible by a grant from the University of Kentucky Research Fund.

<sup>2</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to William Shepard, Jan. 21, 1815, Pettigrew Manuscripts, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill. Hereinafter cited as Pettigrew Mss.

Procuring a vessel was almost as important to the planter as the crop price, for failure to obtain a vessel at the proper time resulted in crops arriving at one of the commission houses during a glutted market.<sup>3</sup>

Schooner captains were haughty lords, fully realizing the importance of their profession to both factor and planter, and were evasive or noncommittal when requested to take on cargoes. Many of the captains in the coastwise schooner trade were "Newengland men" who were anxious to obtain the best possible terms and who drove hard bargains.<sup>4</sup> Many of the commission merchants in the port towns owned schooners, and they, too, drove hard bargains. Through a combination of skill, hard work, and the aid of "dispensations of the Almighty," a planter might raise a quality staple crop; yet the indifference of ship captains or, worse still, the lack of contact with any captain made staple crop marketing an extremely risky business in tidewater North Carolina.<sup>5</sup>

Several cases illustrate the importance of hitting a seller's market on time. Pettigrew's wheat crop of 1819 arrived in New York during a dull market. His factors, Mollan, Rankin and Gallop, reported that the poor quality and the slack demand resulted in a very low price.<sup>6</sup> In 1823 Pettigrew had an excellent crop of wheat and a fair crop of corn to sell. But he peevishly wrote, "I am much plagued in getting a vessel to Ship it and I have not yet

<sup>3</sup> Samuel E. Patrick to Messrs. Charles Pettigrew and Son, Dec. 2, 1806, Ebenezer Pettigrew to Charles Pettigrew, Aug. 17, 1805, and Charles Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1806, *ibid.*; Kelly and Mollan to Ebenezer Pettigrew June 16, 1809, Pettigrew Papers, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh. Hereinafter cited as Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Dec. 21, 1802, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>5</sup> For illustrations of this fatalistic streak in Ebenezer Pettigrew's character, see Ebenezer Pettigrew to Nancy Pettigrew, June 6, 1843, and Charles Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1805?, *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Mollan, Rankin and Gallop to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Sept. 16, 1819, Pettigrew Papers.

shipped my corn. . . .<sup>7</sup> The factor, A. H. Van Bokkelen, who handled this crop stated that although the wheat cargo sent him was of good quality and brought \$1.12 per bushel, it would have commanded \$1.37 had it arrived one week earlier.<sup>8</sup> This represented a loss of more than \$300 to Pettigrew. On many occasions vessels engaged to transport cargoes were unavoidably delayed, with consequent financial loss to the planter.<sup>9</sup> In 1828 Pettigrew complained that he had been trying all fall to get a vessel to take his wheat to New York. Freight to Edenton was expensive, but he felt that if he could get it there, a captain could be persuaded to take it.<sup>10</sup>

Securing a boat in no way ended the pressure under which planters labored. Vessels were forced to run the gauntlet of shifting channels, tides, and possible winds that sometimes beached them near Hatteras and at other times ground the vessels to pieces on the capes.<sup>11</sup> The small coastwise schooners were frequently unseaworthy, and, regardless of the care of the planters, cargoes were often ruined in transit. For example, in 1806, Daniel Bateman was caught in a storm and his vessel shipped a considerable amount of water. The condition of the delivered rice and wheat was described as follows: "The Damp wheat which had stuck to the Tierces had molded the Rice, which the man discovered by boring a gimblet, on which he refused to take it."<sup>12</sup> The factor added: "I am sorry to inform you that the Rice is so much damaged from being shipped or reshaped so often that I have never been able to effect the Sale of it. . . . I shall have the Rice started and endeavor to sepperate the good from bad as soon as possible."<sup>13</sup> In 1822, three tierces of rice shipped to Hall and Mareau of Baltimore

were slightly damaged and suffered a loss in value.<sup>14</sup> Hicks and Smith of New York reported that the corn shipped to them in 1833 was damaged by mold and dampness, caused by the vessel's leaking.<sup>15</sup> The 1842 wheat crop sent to Bryan and Maitland of New York was molding so they took the first price offered in preference to holding the cargo for a higher price and risking rot.<sup>16</sup> These instances of damaged crops illustrate the risks run by planters wedded to the staple crop economy. Since all damages were borne by the planter, Pettigrew's losses on his crops amounted to several thousand dollars.

Like most Southern plantations, Ebenezer Pettigrew's plantations were remote from commercial centers. This rendered it necessary for most supplies and machinery to be shipped to either Edenton or Plymouth, for few vessels would deliver them directly to his plantation. Thus factors found themselves at the mercy of vessel owners when shipping supplies to Pettigrew. For example, Stuart Mollan wrote in 1819 that his firm had experienced great difficulty in getting a vessel to take Ebenezer Pettigrew's supplies.<sup>17</sup> Since some of the factors in Edenton had vessels for hire, Pettigrew usually engaged the factor who could haul his cargo. Eventually he found that he had small sums on deposit with many firms. This served to prevent free use of his cash, for to withdraw funds from one factor could make it difficult to re-engage the vessel of the firm subjected to such undiplomatic financial procedure.

In the light of the fierce competition then existing it is interesting to observe the courtesy of James Armistead, shipowner and commission merchant, toward Pettigrew. "I have commenced loading the Schooners Live Oak & Anthony for the West Indies . . . if I hear nothing more from you . . . I shall ship your Rice . . . but had much rather you shou'd come up before it is shipped . . . and give such Directions respecting it as you may think proper."<sup>18</sup> Mollan, Rankin and Gallop, in the highly competitive commercial center of New York, also adopted a courteous, yet businesslike,

<sup>7</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, July 7, 1823, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>8</sup> A. H. Van Bokkelen to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Aug. 16, 1823, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>9</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Mar. 6, 1819, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>10</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Oct. 21, 1828, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>11</sup> In 1837 John Williams insured Pettigrew's corn because seven cargoes of corn had been lost at Ocracoke between Apr. 1 and June 29 of that year. John Williams to Ebenezer Pettigrew, June 29, 1837, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>12</sup> Charles Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1806, *ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> Samuel E. Patrick to Messrs. Charles Pettigrew and Son, Dec. 2, 1806, *ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Hall and Mareau to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Dec. 20, 1822, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>15</sup> Hicks and Smith to Ebenezer Pettigrew, June 8, 1833, *ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Bryan and Maitland to Ebenezer Pettigrew, July 2, 1842, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>17</sup> Stuart Mollan to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Feb. 3, 1819, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>18</sup> James Armistead to Ebenezer Pettigrew, May 31, 1809, Pettigrew Mss.



attitude. In 1818 they wrote: "Coffee is so high that we did not wish to send it at present it was only 25¢ last week and today it is thirty-two cts. I am sure you get it lower in Edenton when you go over to receive your money from Mr. Collins."<sup>19</sup> These attitudes were common among factors but unusual among shipowners.

The Edenton factors charged for procuring boats to take cargoes. They charged for receiving the crops and cargoes and for storage. When supplies were received they notified Pettigrew and charged him for shipping them to Plymouth in case he failed to call for them in person.<sup>20</sup> The firm of Josiah Collins, Junior, regularly shipped cargoes to Somerset, their plantation adjoining Bonarva. This made that firm the most convenient and desirable of all firms from the standpoint of handling supplies. Yet the high charges of Collins, and the helpful attitude and low charges of the firm of Thomas and W. A. Turner at Plymouth, led Pettigrew to shift his business from the Edenton commission houses to that of Turner. The Turner firm charged a flat commission of 2½ per cent for "handling receiving & passing on shipments from New York" and an extra commission for having articles purchased in New York.<sup>21</sup> In view of the fact that the commission customarily charged for negotiating the sale of entire cargoes was 2½ per cent, this charge appears exorbitant. But the Turner firm had the articles unloaded, reloaded on small boats, and carried to the mouth of Bonarva Canal. Furthermore, they did not take every opportunity to charge for their service. In 1828 they procured a schooner for Pettigrew and when he questioned them regarding the charge, they replied, "We shall not charge you a commission on the procuring of that vessel. We did this thing once and have been sorry for it ever since."<sup>22</sup> On another occasion they neglected to charge for handling an account, giving as their reason, "we have charged no commissions; having had no trouble it being also out of the line of commission business and in the line, in what it affords us pleasure to serve you as a friend."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Stuart Mollan to Ebenezer Pettigrew, July 25, 1818, *ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> See Invoices, Factor Accounts, Bills of Lading, 1803-1828, *ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Thomas and W. A. Turner to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Oct. 14, 1824, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>22</sup> Thomas and W. A. Turner to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1828, *ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Thomas and W. A. Turner to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Apr. 4, 1825, Pettigrew Mss.

Not all the difficulties were with factors or faulty ships. Given favorable weather, a good ship, a sound cargo, and an excellent factor, there was still an occasional accident the cost of which reverted to the planter. Cargoes had to be inspected, and if the inspector were away when they arrived the vessel had to remain in the port while demurrage charges mounted. Even if the cargo was of such nature that it could be unloaded in the absence of an inspector, no sale could be effected.<sup>24</sup> There was bitter competition among the commission houses in securing clearance for their cargoes, and sometimes vessels were unloaded out of turn. Captains frequently charged the port authorities with favoritism. And in case a vessel was shunted aside, the planter bore the risk of both lower price for his cargo and demurrage charges.

Ebenezer Pettigrew found that all the evils discussed above combined were not as grievous as the freight charges of the firms and their schooner captains. Freight rates were exorbitant. For the twenty-five years before Pettigrew bought a schooner, freight and related charges easily accounted for 12 to 20 per cent of the value of his crops. In 1811 he shipped a cargo of wheat to New York on the sloop, *President*, Captain Hale, with freight at 20 cents per bushel. There were 1,395 bushels in the cargo, and on that shipment he paid \$279 for freight exclusive of other shipping charges.<sup>25</sup> The factors reported that the cargo arrived early and was sold for a good price. Gross sales amounted to \$2,319.25. When the other fees were added to the freight and the factor's commission was deducted from the gross and included, 20 per cent of the gross value of that shipment was obviated by freight and marketing charges. Furthermore, the cargo was short 12 bushels, but the factor stated "as it came out in fine order we did not insist on deducting it from the freight."<sup>26</sup>

Other illustrations of extortionate charges on staple crops are plentiful. Freight on 10,087 pounds of rice shipped in 1809 was \$82.05.<sup>27</sup> Tierces of rice usually weighed around 600 pounds gross, and from 1800 to 1820 the charges for carrying rice

<sup>24</sup> Charles Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1806, *ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> Bill of Lading, Schooner *President*, July 13, 1811, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>26</sup> Mollan and Rankin to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Aug. 5, 1811, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>27</sup> Eb. Pettigrew in account current with owners of the Schooner *Anthony*, Aug. 24, 1809, *ibid.*

ran from \$2 to \$3 per tierce.<sup>28</sup> The price of rice was from 3 to 6 cents per pound;<sup>29</sup> therefore, freight charges ranged from 7 to 20 per cent of the sale price. The freight on wheat in the same period was from 15 to 20 cents per bushel. By 1823 this shipping charge had dropped to 13 cents, and it dropped to 10 cents in 1824.<sup>30</sup> The freight on corn was approximately the same as that on wheat, although corn usually sold for from 35 cents to \$1 per bushel lower than wheat.<sup>31</sup> In 1822 Pettigrew shipped a cargo of forest products, wheat, and rice to Hall and Mareau of Baltimore. Charges for handling the products were \$335.60 of a gross sale price of \$1,027.55, leaving to the credit of Pettigrew \$691.95.<sup>32</sup> An examination of bills of lading and invoices would provide many other illustrations.

The charges were especially high for hauling shingles or other forest products. In August 1821, the firm of Blount and Jackson in New York reported to Pettigrew that they had sold 72,500 shingles at \$3.50 per thousand on 4 months credit. The total gross sale was \$239.64, which indicates some hidden charge for the correct gross price was \$253.75. But from the \$239.64 the following charges were deducted: freight, \$126.87; inspecting, \$6.38; wharfage, \$34.00; advertising, 88 cents; 11 months and 6 days interest on freight, \$8.29; and the factor's commission which was 2½ per cent of the gross. The total charge according to the factors was \$182.41; the remainder, \$57.23, was placed to Pettigrew's credit. Two months later, he marketed through the same firm 74,000 shingles for \$243.31; the charges were \$170.16, which left him \$73.15.<sup>33</sup>

Pettigrew was forced to utilize virtually every known passing vessel in order to keep his plantations supplied. Supplies were gathered, boxed, crated, or barreled, charged to his account and shipped to his plantation or to Edenton or to

Plymouth. If they were shipped to Edenton or Plymouth, his factors persuaded passing vessels to drop them off at the mouth of the Scuppernon River. The factors charged for gathering, packing carefully, and sealing all supplies. Pettigrew never complained about these charges. Possibly an experience in New York in 1805 convinced him that they were valid. He wrote his father at that time: "I expect to get everything on board Captain Starr by Tuesday, it is not like Edenton to collect your articles one has to run half over the city for every two things because they deal in but a few articles."<sup>34</sup> The freight to the port of Edenton or Plymouth was added to the cost of the items purchased as was the drayage or cartage.<sup>35</sup> These charges were somewhat alleviated by the deductions allowed for cash payment.<sup>36</sup>

In defense of the vessel owners it should be pointed out that the Albemarle Sound region was filled with shifting shoals and inlets. The waters around Cape Hatteras in that period were referred to as the "graveyard of the Atlantic." Furthermore, the small sailing vessels engaged in the coastwise trade had no advance warning of storms. Since most of the cargoes of wheat and corn were shipped during the storm seasons of spring and early fall, losses were high. Few of the owners could afford the high rates charged for marine insurance; hence, a lost vessel was a total financial loss. Pettigrew realized the ratio between vessel losses and freight rates. On one occasion he wrote: "The loss in those three storms has been enormous & will increase the price of freights."<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, he saw the marketing costs narrowing the margin of profit from year to year. The inconvenience of the shipping arrangements, the uncertainty as to whether his cargo would be properly protected, the high-handed attitude of the captains, the delay and uncertainty attendant to receiving supplies, and many other factors led him to procure a schooner of his own.

In 1828 John Dunbar, a schooner captain of Cool Spring, North Carolina, reached an agreement

<sup>28</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to Stuart Mollan, May 29, 1809, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>29</sup> Lewis Cecil Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860* (2 vols., Washington, 1933), 2: 1030.

<sup>30</sup> Bill of Lading, Sloop *William*, July 13, 1824, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>31</sup> Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, 2: 1039.

<sup>32</sup> Hall and Mareau Invoice, Dec. 20, 1822, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>33</sup> Blount and Jackson Invoice, Aug. 15, Oct. 21, 1821, *ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to Charles Pettigrew, Aug. 17, 1805, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>35</sup> Stuart Mollan to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Nov. 8, 1815, and Josiah Collins Invoice, May 20, 1820, *ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> See Bills and Receipts for Ebenezer Pettigrew's purchases in New York, Aug. 1805, *ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James Johnston Pettigrew, Nov. 15, 1846, *ibid.*

with Pettigrew regarding the operation and ownership of a vessel. Dunbar had impressed Pettigrew as an able and clever captain while handling his cargoes. Dunbar went to Beaufort shortly after Christmas in 1828 to get carpenters to build a vessel of 60 tons. The Pettigrew slaves began to cut trees and float them to the sawmill where they were cut into the proper sizes and flatted down the Batavia (Bonarva) Canal to Fork Creek. In 1825, William Woodley had widened Fork Creek and had cleaned out the bay, thereby making the mouth of Fork Creek at the "big bay" wide and deep enough for vessels of 75 tons.<sup>38</sup> The partners proposed to bring the carpenters to the creek and construct the vessel there. Pettigrew wrote to James C. Johnston, his wealthy planter crony of the Roanoke River Valley, telling him of his plans. "I am now very busily engaged getting the timber for a Vessel of about 60 tons which I am about to build in partnership with a capt. Dunbar, we expect to get her ready for the next wheat crop. I have full confidence in my partner the Captain as an honest, active, industrious man."<sup>39</sup> He added that he was using money loaned him by Johnston to pay debts, purchase mares to breed mules, "and the remainder in building this vessil." Johnston was alarmed at the idea and said:

I should have advised you most strenuously to have nothing to do with Vessels or Vessel Building. The latter can not end profitable to you, the holding and running them would be more so. There are several objections to farmers owning vessels, first they are a kind of property over which you can have little or no control you must rely on your capt., the wind & weather the capt. you now have may be a very good man and to be relied upon—but the human character is extremely changeable and these vicissitudes are So frequent has astonished me . . . your vessil must go.

Johnston cited the case of his friends, D. and William Clark. D. Clark made a fortune in trade but told Johnston confidentially that he had never made a cent on his vessels. William did not believe his brother and spent \$6,000 to \$7,000 "before he would be convinced of the correctness of his brothers opinion." Johnston asked Pettigrew how he expected to make money if merchants could not. But he understood Pettigrew's motive; "I know well the motive that prompts you to build it is the inconvenience of getting your produce to market

I have felt the inconvenience myself but never thot of owning a vessel a river or canal boat was the summit of my ambition." Johnston urged Pettigrew to continue with his project of draining the Savannah lands, "a great & important object." He said:

I have given orders to my overseer in Pasquotank to get timber & materials to build a canal boat, which will not cost me much and with which I can with my own negroes, and at no expence except the tole carry my produce thro' the canal to Norfolk where if it does not sell at a fair price it can be Shipt at very reduced freight to any other market foreign or domestic. I think Norfolk will become a great grain & Lumber market."

Pettigrew could have access to his canal boat. Johnston added: "I think you might count with certainty of having a crop of grain in New York in four or five days, whereas by Occracocke it might be a month." He was candid enough to state that he wanted to "dismount you from your hobby to mount you on mine." In concluding his long and far from calm counsel he remarked, "my dear friend if you can honorably get off from this vessel engagement even at some pecuniary loss I would advise you to do it."<sup>40</sup>

For the only time in his long association with his friend and creditor, Pettigrew was placed in the position of discounting his advice. This weighed on his mind, and several weeks later he wrote:

I received also with great pleasure your advice on the subject of vessil building. It is another evidence of the interest which you take in my welfare. . . . The Captain is half owner and has funds, and credit he says to full amount of all the would ask in Batemen where he is best known, the vessil is to be about 60 tons, and I cannot lose but 30 tons, with all I am plagued to death for a vessil and have exhausted my whole stock of patience to get them. But after all my thoughts & calculation & vexation, if, I had not gone too far I would not build. But luck is the Lord, and I am a calculating rusher, & hope to succeed.<sup>41</sup>

Despite his concentration on vessel building, Pettigrew wrote again several days later, with Johnston's advice still on his mind.

In that answer I made some reply to your kind & friendly advise on the subject of vessil building, all of

<sup>38</sup> William Woodley's affidavit, 1844? *ibid*.

<sup>39</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Jan. 13, 1829, *ibid*.

<sup>40</sup> James C. Johnston to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Feb. 17, 1829, *ibid*.

<sup>41</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Mar. 12, 1829, *ibid*.

which I received with the pleasing knowledge of its coming from my best friend. Had I received it in time it should unquestionably have had its deer weight, but my partner the Captain had then gone to Beaufort, for carpenters, and the most of the materials were in the yard, consequently there was no backing or turning. The keel is laid, the stern, sternpost &c are up, the spars are got & so far we are going on well. I am pleased with the master workman and the other hands hired from Beaufort seven in number appear to be good. I feel highly flattered by your remark, that I look before I leap, that I always consider well what I am going to do and farther that I always get through successfully all my undertakings.<sup>42</sup>

The construction of the vessel was uninterrupted for several days. Pettigrew was preoccupied with vessel building.<sup>43</sup> He reported to Johnston in June:

Our vessil will be compleated at farthest in three weeks. The Captain is now in Baltimore geting the sails riging & iron work, as soon as he returns she will be launched riged and then loaded, which I hope will be between the 1 & 5 of July. I shall then proceed in her to Edenton for the purpose of taking out the necessary papers, when I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you... Mr. Woodley has been closely employed on the Creek, and there has been a great deal of mud taken out, a Vessil drawing 6 ft is able to land at my upper thoroughfare at common tide.<sup>44</sup>

The three weeks passed, and Pettigrew wrote again to explain the delay:

I believe I wrote you that I expected to launch by the 4th July but from the rainy weather since my writing we Shall not be able to launch so soon. It is now so near the time that we can speak with certainty. The Lady of the Lake will be put to her destined element between the 9 & 11th without fail, and the weather permitting she will be ready to sail for Edenton by 16th.<sup>45</sup>

Neighboring farmers supplemented the work of Pettigrew's slaves and the imported carpenters. Allen Alexander, Hardy Woodley, Alvy Woodley, and John H. Fanning hewed timber for the vessel. The Beaufort carpenters received \$1.50 per day

and worked 100 days in constructing and in outfitting the schooner in the Scuppernong River. The costs of labor and incidental supplies were \$1,074.50,<sup>46</sup> and other charges ran the total cost of the vessel as she put out to sea to \$3,308.46 $\frac{1}{2}$ .<sup>47</sup> Dunbar did not completely pay for his half of the vessel, giving Pettigrew a note for \$882.30 $\frac{3}{4}$ .<sup>48</sup>

The *Lady of the Lake* was launched on August 2, 1829. On her maiden voyage Pettigrew shipped wheat to New York. This vessel conveyed Pettigrew's staple and miscellaneous crops to market for eight years. He was charged the current freight rates and paid one-half of all expenses of the vessel's upkeep. The harbor and related charges were paid by his factors and charged against his account. Pettigrew kept a strict account of the voyages and "expenses of the *Lady of the Lake*." When the vessel was not engaged in rushing his produce to market, the cargoes of neighboring planters were solicited, and the profits from such trips were equally divided between the owners.

Between the launching and the cryptic remark erroneously placed on the profit side, "To Edenton & then lost at sea by Capt. S. Spruill," the *Lady of the Lake* made 46 voyages. The destination of the first 30 voyages was recorded: 18 to New York, 2 to Baltimore, 5 to Charleston, 2 to Providence, 2 to Boston, and 1 to Occracoke. The total operating cost for the 46 voyages was \$1,325.71; and the profits from these voyages was \$2,977.42.<sup>49</sup> Whether this is Pettigrew's half share of the receipts or whether the operating costs were deducted is not known. Since he kept a separate account, which included payment for freight, with the captains it is logical to assume that this figure represents his profit.

The ship was crippled at sea and abandoned on her forty-sixth voyage. In February 1837, John Williams wrote: "The Lady of the Lake was abandoned at Cha on the 15th Jany and should the crew have reached home I will thank you to have the protest noted & Extended if not previously done and forward me to enable me to collect

<sup>42</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Mar. 30, 1829, *ibid*.

<sup>43</sup> Mrs. Ann S. Pettigrew to Mrs. Mary Bryan, Apr. 5, 1829, Bryan Mss., North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

<sup>44</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, June 5, 1829, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>45</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, June 30, 1829, *ibid*.

<sup>46</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew Lady of the Lake Accounts, Aug. 21, 1829, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>47</sup> Belgrade Plantation Book, 1816-1840, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>48</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew Lady of the Lake Accounts, Aug. 21, 1829, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>49</sup> Belgrade Plantation Book, 1816-1840, Pettigrew Mss.



Insurance on the cargo of corn."<sup>50</sup> The gale on the fifteenth of January had so injured the vessel that she was unsalvageable. The loss of the schooner forced Pettigrew to resume haggling with captains and owners. Next to his sawmill, the *Lady of the Lake* had been his especial pride and joy. He wrote a ship builder, sometime after he received the Williams letter, as follows:

You no doubt have heard that the *Lady of the Lake* was lost in January last. Her loss has put me to some inconvenience and I should like to get another if to be had on reasonable terms.

What would you ask to build me one all ready for the sails & riging. In every respect as well put together & of as good materials (except pine plank instead of cypress, the pine to be from trees not bored [for turpentine] and cut at the proper season of the year) of [?] tunage & draft of water viz. fifty tons, & drawing not one half inch more than seven feet water when in trim. The *Lady of the Lake* was as good and strong a vessel as I wanted, and sailed well I should wish this Vesil to Sail as well and to cary grain and consequently must be tolerably sharp.<sup>51</sup>

In his haste to obtain a schooner, he toyed with the idea of building. He drew a rough picture of the vessel he wanted and set down her dimensions as follows:

A vessell 35 feete Beams; 4 feete 10 in Hole make 26 tons all the Sparse [Spars] with 2 Botts ring Bolts pumps winless and painting the vessel to be twenty six . . . [illegible] a vessel 44 feat ceale; 16 feete Beame; 4 feete 10 inches hole makes 35 tons thirty five tons all the sparse with 9 bolts ring Boats pumps winless.<sup>52</sup>

In October, Banister Midyette sold to Pettigrew and Joseph A. Spruill, who had been the last co-proprietor and captain of the *Lady of the Lake*, a schooner, the *Virginia Hodges*, for \$2,000. The vessel had been completed on June 2, 1835, and had one deck and two masts. The dimensions of the vessel were: length, 53 feet 8 inches; width, 19 feet 3 inches; depth, 5 feet 11½ inches; and "she measure 57 tons."<sup>53</sup> Spruill who negotiated the purchase wrote:

I have bought the *Virginia Hodges* for two thousand dollars and she is in as bad order as she well could bee

<sup>50</sup> John Williams to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Feb. 28, 1837, *ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to ————?, 1838, *ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> Dimensions of Boat, 1838, *ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> Bill of Sale, Banister Midyette to Ebenezer Pettigrew and Joseph A. Spruill, Oct. 19, 1837, *ibid.*

to go to sea. I am in E. City fitin out which I expect will take me about ten days I believe she is as good a vessel as their is in these waters and I think will cost around twenty-three hundred dollars when she leaves this place I was bout seven weeks looking and making inquires and I could not see nor hear of no good vessel for sale vessels never were so high for you cant buy a good vessel in good order at no price. I am told that we cant get our North Carolina vessels insured at all because Ocracoke is so bad if I had noon it I would not have bought you will hear from me soon as I get fited.<sup>54</sup>

The *Virginia Hodges* caused Pettigrew considerably more trouble than the *Lady of the Lake*. The records on her voyages are confused. A complete account is available for only the eleventh voyage and the thirteenth through the twenty-third voyages. According to Pettigrew's figures his shares of the gross freight income for the 12 voyages was \$1,634.47½, and the total expenses for the same voyages were \$1,068.20¼, which left him a profit of \$566.27. But these figures were not well kept and have several questionable features.<sup>55</sup> It is difficult to determine how many voyages the vessel made. The vessel sailed during five years of unusually rough weather, and on at least three occasions it was seriously damaged. In 1842 it was driven onto a reef. "The *Virginia Hodges*, left from New York Sunday night before the storm and is on shore Checacomomic banks. This you will say is rather a gloomy prospect."<sup>56</sup> The vessel had to be dry-docked at Elizabeth City and the repairs cost more than \$300. In November, 1842, Pettigrew wrote James C. Johnston that the *Virginia Hodges* "has cost since she left New York two days before the storm of July including a suit sails got while at New York at that \$1,060. A nice sum to make over the left shoulder."<sup>57</sup> In July 1843, Pettigrew sold his share of the schooner to Joseph Spruill for \$600 and ended his career as a shipowner.<sup>58</sup>

In his fifteen-year effort to escape high rates Pettigrew invested in two vessels. He had to deal with five captains and found his friend James C.

<sup>54</sup> Joseph A. Spruill to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Oct. 29, 1837, *ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> Statement of Account Between Ebenezer Pettigrew and Jos. Spruill to Owner, Mar. 8, 1842, *ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, July 19, 1842, *ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Nov. 15, 1842, *ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Bill of Sale, July 3, 1843, Pettigrew Papers.

Johnston's remarks about them unjustified. The first captain and co-owner of the *Lady of the Lake* was John Dunbar. In 1833 Dunbar "quit the vessels on account of his health" and was replaced as captain but not as owner by Spencer Combs. According to Charles L. Pettigrew, Combs was a "very smart man."<sup>89</sup> Dunbar returned to active captaincy in 1834, having been so invigorated by his rest that he had married. But he was not satisfied at his old job and indicated several times that he would like to renounce the business and sell his share of the vessel. By 1836 he had located a purchaser. Pettigrew described the transaction in this manner: "The one half of my vessil has changed owners. I have not seen the Captain who has become the purchaser since. His name is Simion Spruill, his post office Columbia Tyrrell Co. I am of the belief he is a smart fellow & a good captain."<sup>90</sup> But after Pettigrew had seen Spruill he revised his opinion. A few months later the vessel sailed just before a storm, and his son, Charles, informed him with regard to Spruill, "I understand he is ignorant of navigation or been lost."<sup>91</sup> Whether or not that opinion was justified, the *Lady of the Lake* was lost within eleven months. Joseph Spruill, co-proprietor with Pettigrew of the *Virginia Hodges*, was an excellent captain. But for some reason he did not act as captain after 1840. The joint owners hired William Rollins to command the vessel and paid him \$30 per month.<sup>92</sup> Rollins was an unusually clever captain and was liked by the commission men. All the captains were personable, and there was seldom any discord between them and Pettigrew.

The importance of the captains and their successful handling of vessels is obvious. Good judgment on their part meant money in the pocket of the shipper. On one occasion head winds forced Captain Dunbar to turn back from Boston to New York. Upon examining his cargo he found the corn hot and mold appearing in the center. He contacted John S. Bryan, and they rushed the sale at below the market price in order to get the cargo sold before mold ruined it. On another occasion Dunbar used his judgment and made money

for his associate. Pettigrew related the incident to his sister-in-law in the following language:

I have just shipped another cargo of corn to New York where the others went (instead of Charleston). The cause of its going to New York was the Captain at the bar learned that the Charlestown market was glutted corn was 38 to 75¢ pr bus. and believing it better in New York he ran for that place; and it sold for 94¢ I suppose 20¢ in the bus. a difference of 4 or 5 hundred dollars in the load.<sup>93</sup>

This freedom of action was a definite advantage for a planter owning his vessel. Captains congregated at the bar, and the information obtained there was far more recent and more accurate than any possessed by shippers. Unlike captains of vessels with cargoes consigned to be delivered to a specific port, Pettigrew's captains dared change their destination.

Incomplete records do not permit one to determine whether Pettigrew marketed his crops at less expense during the fifteen years he owned his own vessels than in the thirty years when he did not own vessels. But those records which have survived tend to render irrefragable the conclusion that he made money on his crops by having ready access to a vessel. There was greater freedom of action in his choice of selling points, and he was able to vary his commission houses. He was able to time his sales and thereby place his cargoes on sale when the price was highest. The freight he paid was comparable to that paid by his planter friends, but when the vessels which he partially owned were not hauling his crops, they hauled those of his neighbors. An illustration of his captain's eagerness to stay busy is found in 1842. "Captain Rollins has come . . . he wishes . . . you to enquire if he can get a load of corn in Plymouth to carry. If he cannot get a freight he wishes to know whether he can purchase a load."<sup>94</sup> Pettigrew received half the proceeds from these voyages, and the profits from such voyages should be deducted from his freight.

The vessel more than repaid Pettigrew his capital outlay by enabling him to get his crops to an early market. Difficulty in reaching markets was one of the reasons he became a shipowner, and, insofar as the records are to be relied upon, that difficulty was infrequently encountered after he built the

<sup>89</sup> Charles L. Pettigrew to James Johnston Pettigrew, May 25, 1833, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>90</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, Dec. 3, 1836, *ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> Charles L. Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Feb. 16, 1837, *ibid.*

<sup>92</sup> William Rollins Receipts, Sept. 16, 1842, *ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to Mrs. Mary S. Bryan, Aug. 29, 1836, *ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> William Shepard Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew,

*Lady of the Lake*.<sup>65</sup> In 1833 Hicks and Smith reported: "The wheat by the *Lady of The Lake*, is the only parcel of new yet in the market."<sup>66</sup> This cargo had commanded a good price, and when he shipped it, Pettigrew had said: "The wheat is inferior . . . I have a hope it will be the first in market, and thereby command a tolerable price."<sup>67</sup> These examples illustrate the advantages which accrued to Pettigrew when he was able to get ships to rush his cargoes to market. Millers, distillers, starch makers, bakers, all clamored for the first cargo and Pettigrew sought to benefit by the rivalry. In 1838 John S. Bryan wrote: ". . . we have just this moment closed the sales of your wheat at 1.60 Per Bus. this was the best price we could get and more than we expected a few days ago it being the first in market and the quality very good."<sup>68</sup> Jonathan Trimble wrote in 1839: "it is the first cargo of new wheat that has arrived and has been admired . . . Several millers wanted thy wheat for which 1.20 was offered . . . but I sold it at 1.30 the purchaser was anxious to obtain the first cargo to send to a mill."<sup>69</sup> There are many such statements in letters during the period when Pettigrew owned schooners, and he must have derived a great deal of comfort from refuting James C. Johnston's ideas about owning a ship. In fact, Pettigrew's success with his vessels led Johnston to purchase a schooner.<sup>70</sup>

Just how much Pettigrew gained from the top prices he received is hard to estimate. In the instance previously cited, he admitted that the captain's decision to go to New York was worth "4 or 5 hundred dollars" to him.<sup>71</sup> Virtually all of his sales while he owned a ship were over the market price, and without doubt these ventures enabled Pettigrew to realize many times more than he invested. Pettigrew himself realized the ad-

vantages and the savings effected.<sup>72</sup> Why he discontinued his partnership in the *Virginia Hodges* is unexplained. Possibly his conservative son, William, upon whom he relied for counsel, advised him against the enterprise. Pettigrew entertained the idea of buying a ship on several occasions.<sup>73</sup>

As a shipowner Pettigrew encountered obstacles that neither he nor his friend Johnston anticipated. This was the virtual oligopoly of ports effected by the vessels owned by factors. Where a vessel owned by a planter appeared, the harbor master, the measurer, the inspector, or any of a dozen port employees could by slight favoritism delay the vessel in favor of one in which they were interested. Apparently, as transportation facilities improved, competition led to outright discrimination against privately owned vessels. Some captains were indifferent to this treatment, well satisfied with the extra time in the port grog shops such delay afforded. But the captains of the *Lady of the Lake* and the *Virginia Hodges* were not inured nor did they become habituated to such handling, and their partner was acrimonious in his comments to factors who permitted the authorities to delay his cargoes. In fact, he complained so bitterly that both captains and factors made a point of informing him when delay was unavoidable. Thus in 1840 when the *Virginia Hodges* returned to the mouth of Fork Creek, Charles announced the arrival to his father, and added that the captain "Sent word that he had been at Charlestown and other places he wished you to write [the factors] that he met with no detention this time."<sup>74</sup> John Williams explained a delay of one day because Good Friday was a holiday in Charleston. In 1839 Williams reported that Pettigrew's corn had been stored and that it turned "clammy and blue." Pettigrew replied that his captain stated that the corn was damp because he could not get it measured promptly and peremptorily demanded that his vessels receive "dispatch." Williams replied that in the future cargoes would move faster for he would secure clearance. But the situation was unchanged in 1840, and Pettigrew again wrote Williams demanding "dispatch." Williams at that

<sup>65</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to John Heritage Bryan, Aug. 15, 1843, *ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> Hicks and Smith to Ebenezer Pettigrew, July 9, 1833, Pettigrew Papers.

<sup>67</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to Hicks and Smith, June 22, 1833, *ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> John S. Bryan and Company to Ebenezer Pettigrew, July 25, 1838, Pettigrew Mss.

<sup>69</sup> Jonathan Trimble to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Aug. 1, 1839, *ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> William S. Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Sept. 6, 1842, *ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to Mrs. Mary S. Bryan, Aug. 29, 1836, *ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to John H. Bryan, Aug. 15, 1843, *ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> Jesse Patridge to William S. Pettigrew, Sept. 25, 1847, and John Williams to Charles L. Pettigrew, July 8, 1847, *ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> Charles L. Pettigrew to Ebenezer Pettigrew, 1840?, *ibid.*

time was holding a cargo of corn in anticipation of a rise in price, but he promptly sold it and informed Pettigrew that he should allow him to use his discretion as he could have sold it for a higher price in two or three days.<sup>75</sup> By 1842 Williams had the Charleston situation in hand as both he and the captains reported that they secured clearance. Trimble and Wilson had some difficulty in Baltimore as did Hicks and Smith in New York. But pressure from Pettigrew and complaints from the captains served to spur them to facilitate the loading and unloading of his vessels.

<sup>75</sup> John Williams to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Apr. 4, June 14, 1839, June 17, 18, 1840, Pettigrew Papers.

After the sale of the *Virginia Hodges*, Pettigrew returned to the old method of haggling with captains. The severe storms of 1843 wrecked many vessels and sent freight rates soaring in comparison with crop prices. Since he had given up his two larger plantations, Bonarva and Belgrade, and retired to the small one, Magnolia, he did not insist that his sons join him in purchasing a vessel. Yet many times he must have desired the freedom of crop marketing which he enjoyed from 1828 to 1843.<sup>76</sup> In those years he had virtually overcome the problems attendant to marketing his crops.

<sup>76</sup> Ebenezer Pettigrew to William S. Pettigrew, May 18, 1847, Pettigrew Mss.

## BRITISH-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISE IN THE WEST BETWEEN 1870 AND 1900, AND SOME AGRARIAN REACTIONS

ROGER V. CLEMENTS

*Sheffield, England*

Some of the most significant aspects of British investment in America have been neglected by historians who chiefly concerned themselves either with the semi-autonomous ebb and flow of securities across the Atlantic, or with the anonymous British capital put into American railroads. In the development of the trans-Mississippi West after 1865 this alien money played a more active part than that of a catalyst. A high proportion of it after the Civil War went into enterprises which demanded and received conscious supervision on the part of the investors.<sup>1</sup> These interests were as varied and extensive as the Mississippi valley itself, and participated, at the grass-roots, in the exploitation of the area. Consequently they could not avoid being involved, in their own peculiar ways, in the stresses and strains of that rapid development. This study will suggest the kind of relations which tended to subsist in these circumstances, between the British enterprise and the American population amongst whom it operated.<sup>2</sup>

Western society between 1870 and 1900 was in a state of flux. The farmer faced a variety of vital,

new problems. Some were purely natural, like those posed by the locust and the climate. Water was short in many places and often the farmer found himself reliant upon artificial sources of supply. Other problems were due to the rapidity of settlement and the vastness of the territory. The transportation of his produce back to the markets of the East was difficult and expensive. More money was needed for this kind of pioneering than for that of earlier days, but it was hard to get. To the farmer it appeared that eastern capital, whether concentrated in industrial trusts, or controlling the railroads, owned him body and soul, politically and economically. Though he bought in a protected market, world factors dictated the prices he got for his produce. Moreover, he found that suitable new land was fast becoming scarce in the 1880's, and the modes of agriculture very different from those to which he was accustomed. In that period the western farmer was a strange compound of optimism and disappointment; he had not found the promised land. He wanted to move on, but the bleak realisation of swiftly disappearing opportunities halted him, restless. Traditionally an individualist, he was hampered by unseen outside factors, most of which he traced to the power of concentrated capital east of the Alleghenies.

It was within this environment that British capital enterprises in the trans-Mississippi West

<sup>1</sup> It remained in a large measure subject to relatively blind economic forces; and it was quantitatively less than was formerly subscribed to state and federal debts, and than was currently poured into railroads.

<sup>2</sup> The variety and extent of British investment in the West will be dealt with in further articles together with other aspects of western reaction.



took on features between 1870 and 1900 that made their presence singularly consequential at the social bases. Their ubiquity did this; so did the variety of their investment; so did the topography of this new society, which like the plains themselves, made any curious feature particularly prominent. Most important was their organisational character. The methods by which British investment was controlled within the western economy between 1870 and 1900 had much to do with the growth of western legends about British character and motives.

Experience with Jay Gould had made American-controlled enterprises repugnant to many British investors. Wars between railroad kings were ruining the property of British bond and shareholders; and "there is absolutely no security, even in the State of New York, that the most solid properties may not fall into the hands of a Fisk, Gould, and Vanderbilt gang, and be applied to Opera House orgies and purposes."<sup>3</sup> Much of the English investment in railroads was in the form of bonds, without voting power. These paid for the actual construction, whilst the stock usually represented water, as in the case of the Erie.<sup>4</sup> Since railroads continued to be the chief receptacle for British capital in America throughout this period attempts were made to exert some influence on policy. The "English Association of American Bond and Share Holders" was set up to put collective pressure on presidents and directors, but it met little success.<sup>5</sup> The enormous British investment in American railways remained strikingly passive and uninfluential.<sup>6</sup>

When examining western offerings Britons now required the chance to acquire a controlling share of the stock in any particular enterprise.<sup>7</sup> The most certain ways of doing this were either to promote a purely British company, or at least to incorporate it under the laws of the United King-

dom and register it like any domestic company in London or Edinburgh. Then the stock would be offered exclusively to Englishmen, except that part retained by the American vendors (if any), or reserved for American investors. Alternatively, English promoters might take an option on American properties, as in the case of the breweries which attracted so much British capital in the years 1888 to 1890, and often on mining enterprises; then a company was formed and issued stock in England. The boards of directors were composed almost wholly of Englishmen, but, in an attempt to make the original American vendors responsible for any irregularities which might subsequently come to light, and also to retain their experience, one or two of them would be made directors.<sup>8</sup> When Americans formed corporations in the United States and next approached English capitalists, they often found it necessary to assent to the flotation of an English company both to raise money and to oversee the operations on behalf of the English investors in order to inspire confidence.<sup>9</sup>

In the early years in California it had been found that absentee control from so great a distance had been a severe handicap to efficient company operation.<sup>10</sup> The improvement of communications made such remote surveillance more feasible, but further devices were necessary.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>3</sup> For example see the *Prospectus* of the Colorado Freehold Land and Emigration Company, Ltd. for 1869.

<sup>4</sup> Despite Dr. Nathan Boyd's expenditure and blandishments on behalf of the construction of a dam on the Rio Grande in 1896, he had to agree to the formation of an English company to raise the money on the security of the American company's property. Nathan E. Boyd, "History of the Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company and the Elephant Butte Dam Case," 56 Cong., 2 Sess., *Senate Document* 104, serial 4033 (1901), 3-4. The Farwells had to submit to a similar arrangement with the Capitol Freehold Land and Investment Company, Ltd., when they were building the Capitol at Austin, Texas. Lewis Nordyke, *Cattle Empire* (New York, 1949), 74, 169, 195-207.

<sup>5</sup> Sir Henry Vere Huntley grew impatient with the board of the Anglo-California Gold Mining Company. Huntley, *California; its Gold and its Inhabitants* (London, 1856), 154-7.

<sup>6</sup> Even in 1909 the Anglo-Californian Bank at San Francisco, finding "by experience that the work of the bank was hampered by the head office being in London . . . the directors therefore decided to go into liquidation" *The Economist*, 68: 1072 (May 22, 1909).

<sup>7</sup> *The Economist* (London), 28: 1452 (Dec. 3, 1870).

<sup>8</sup> John Moody, *The Masters of Capital* (New Haven, 1919), 29-30.

<sup>9</sup> *The Economist*, 42: 1512 (Dec. 13, 1884); 43: 1231 (Oct. 10, 1885).

<sup>10</sup> Leland H. Jenks, "Britain and American Railway Development," *Journal of Economic History*, 11: 378-81 (Fall, 1951).

<sup>11</sup> During the struggle over the anti-alien act of 1887 it was argued that the limitation of alien stock-holding in territorial companies to a maximum of 20 per cent, stopped Britons investing as they desired control. 50 Cong., 2 Sess., *Senate Reports* 2690 (1889), 12.

One was to retain the original American interested parties as directors and managers. Thus Pillsbury was retained as manager when British interests took over the Pillsbury-Washburn flour milling and grain storage plant in Minneapolis.<sup>12</sup> Some cattle companies resorted to another expedient. They sent out young relatives of the directors to fulfil several purposes—to make a provision in life for these younger sons; perhaps to reform them in a bucolic and presumably innocent environment; but also to keep a watch on the local management, and to constitute an alternative source of information. It was not often that any of these purposes was reliably achieved.<sup>13</sup> Visits by members of boards of directors to cattle, mining, or other properties were frequent, and it was usual for British experts to be sent out to inspect and report on developments like irrigation canals and mines before and after purchase.<sup>14</sup> An even stronger bid to keep effective control in British hands was made by employing Englishmen as agents or resident managers of properties. The career of John Clay on the range as go-between, negotiator, and manager on behalf of Scottish boards of directors, is well known. Technical knowledge was an asset, but with him, and the famous cattle men Murdo McKenzie and W. J. Tod, it was primarily the fact of their British origin which prompted their appointment in the first place. In mining, too, English companies preferred to employ compatriots. Richard Pearce was sent out to superintend ore-reduction works near

Georgetown in the early 1870's and later became Vice-Consul at Denver. Amongst others were Philip Argall, and William Weston. James Duff was the well-known manager of the Colorado Mortgage and Investment Company, and director of other large Denver concerns. Sir Stuart James Hogg, president of the British Land and Mortgage Company of America, Ltd., not only visited the scene of its operations in Kansas, but had his son groomed for the residential managerial position.<sup>15</sup>

Whatever the weaknesses of these schemes, the essential fact is that during this period, in a wide variety of enterprises throughout the West, English control was foremost, whether through directors, special emissaries, technical experts, or resident local managers.<sup>16</sup> English capitalists were constantly reported as travelling in the region and conferring with indigenous big-wigs. The arrival of a man like the mining engineer Hamilton Smith, reputed to be the Rothschilds' agent, set off the wildest rumors as to future British plans. English investment in the West between 1870 and 1900 meant very visible and tangible British participation in, and control of, manifold aspects of western economic life. It had assumed a quite different nature from that which it possessed in earlier periods and after 1900. True, much heat had been engendered by the repudiation of debt claims by the states after 1837, but this, and the complaints of British holders of southern Civil War bonds, kindled no lasting positive feelings in native bosoms. No self-conscious British purposes could be discerned at work alongside American day-to-day strivings; British control and manipulation of American resources was not evident. More striking still was the equable acceptance of enormous British holdings in Ameri-

<sup>12</sup> *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1934), 14: 605.

<sup>13</sup> Archibald J. Marjoribanks, youngest son of Baron Tweedmouth, during several years of invigilation over the Rocking Chair Ranch, failed to detect the nefarious dealings of the manager which finally denuded the ranch of cattle. Estelle D. Tinkler, "History of the Rocking Chair Ranch," *Panhandle-Plains Historical Review*, 15: 19, 29, 75 (1942). The besetting sin of young Walter de S. Maud, the representative of the Capitol Freehold Land and Investment Company at the XIT ranch, was intemperance, which seriously affected his value. Nurdyke, *Cattle Empire*, 91-2, 155. S. G. Flook, bookkeeper at the Spur Ranch, and nephew of Sir Charles Hamilton, M. P., a stockholder, had to be dismissed for drunkenness. William C. Holden, *The Spur Ranch* (Boston, 1934), 25, 102.

<sup>14</sup> Colonel W. J. Engledue of the Royal Engineers and the imperial irrigation works of India inspected the proposed site of the Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande. Nathan Boyd, "History of the Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company," 4.

<sup>15</sup> Argall became manager of Stratton's Independence in 1912. *Denver Republican*, Jan. 27, 1891; Colorado Bureau of Mines, *Report*, 1911-12, p. 74-5, 79, 88. For Weston, see *Anglo-Colorado Mining and Milling Guide* (London), 1: 25 (March 26, 1898). He acted as agent for the Guston Silver Mine Company, Ltd., in 1886. Colorado Secretary of State, *Report*, 1884-6, p. 46. For Duff see *Rocky Mountain News*, Jan. 1, 1885, and *Denver Tribune Republican*, Jan. 20, 30, 1885. For the Hogg, see Louise Barry, "A British Bride in Manhattan 1890-1," *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, 19: 269-82 (Aug., 1951).

<sup>16</sup> The British consul at San Francisco condemned lax preparations, and also the British middleman or promoter. *The Economist*, 53: 913 (July 13, 1895).

can railroads in the 1880's, due to the inert, neutral character of these investments. Despite the hostility in which both railroads and the British were held, and despite the ease with which querulous editors perceived far less obvious associations between evil and Britons, it was seldom that these two arch-fiends were attacked as allies. The New York correspondent of the *Economist* noted in 1889 that the English "... practical interest in American railway shares for many years past has not called for special comment."<sup>17</sup> British investment in national or state debts, even in railroads, aroused no interest because they were impersonal, subject more to general influences than to individual preferences. British investment in the trans-Mississippi West between 1870 and 1900 consisted much more of enterprises that made western development bend to British purposes and interests.<sup>18</sup>

In these circumstances English enterprises would have to be managed very skilfully if they were to avoid special enmity. Amity needs at the least an identity of interest between the investors and the people affected by the investment, yet even this basic requirement was difficult to achieve. The failure to know and understand the western environment did not always imply a moral obtuseness on the part of the British. The Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company, Limited, formed in 1896 in London with a glittering board of directors and an enthusiastic prospectus, was to aid an American company of the same name to

build a dam on the Rio Grande at Elephant Butte by raising money through the sale of bonds, with a lease on the New Mexican property as security. This enterprise got entangled innocently in a web of economic, political, and diplomatic strands woven by local, State, Federal, and Mexican interests, in which it struggled for nine years, to be discarded at length, drained of its red gold.<sup>19</sup> Championed strenuously by Governor Otero, the local political parties, business interests, and individuals, it was completely abandoned by the New Mexicans when the Federal government, having long blocked its operations, undertook to carry out its purposes.<sup>20</sup> Towards the alien investors no responsibility was felt when their monied usefulness became redundant.

On the other hand the reverse held true. Exceptional to the general rule that British investors in American railroads lacked influence were the stockholders of the Oregonian Railway Company, Limited. This was incorporated in Dundee in 1880 with the Earl of Airrie as chairman, and though William Reid of Portland was the initiator and local manager, ultimate control remained in Scotland.<sup>21</sup> The project of building a narrow gauge railroad in the Willamette valley to compete with Villard's monopolistic system awakened the moral and financial support of the farmers.<sup>22</sup> When construction into Portland was held up they demanded that the legislature not give up the

<sup>17</sup> *The Economist*, 47: 965 (July 27, 1889). On the transition of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad from the hands of the receiver to those of the bondholders, the *Denver Tribune Republican*, July 13, 1886, commented, ignoring the fact that most of the bondholders were English, "The Rio Grande is peculiarly a Colorado road, and all the people of the State rejoice to see that the days of prosperity are returning." This is the more illuminating as these bondholders, exceptionally, did have some influence on the policy of the Denver and Rio Grande. See William Jackson, "The Record Versus Reminiscence," *Westerners' Brand Book* (Denver, 1945), 1: 62, 65, 74, 80-1, 85.

<sup>18</sup> This change also took place in British investments in the East, but it was contemporaneous with the growth of the trans-Mississippi West and of British interest in the region. English investment was relatively of much greater economic importance in the West than in the East, and due to the economic ordeals through which the West passed, it was also of greater political and social importance there.

<sup>19</sup> "Reports from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General, with accompanying papers relative to the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande River," 55 Cong., 2 Sess., *Senate Documents* 229, serial 3610 (1898), 4-7, 24-6, 186-7, 192. Nathan E. Boyd, "History of the Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Company," 3-5; Ralph E. Twitchell, *The Leading Facts of New Mexican History* (2 vols., Cedar Rapids, 1912), 2: 529.

<sup>20</sup> Miguel A. Otero, *My Nine Years as Governor* (Albuquerque, 1940), 30-33. The Governor's message of 1905 omitted reference to the company. New Mexico, *Council Journal*, 36 Sess. (1905), 28-9.

<sup>21</sup> Reid was connected with the Oregon and Washington Mortgage Savings Bank; the Oregon and Washington Trust Investment Company of Scotland; the Salem Mills Company; First National Bank of Salem; Portland National Bank. Most of these used Scots capital—he lent \$6,000,000 of Scottish money in 10 years. H. K. Hines, *Illustrated History of Oregon* (Chicago, 1893), 310-1.

<sup>22</sup> *Portland Oregonian*, Feb. 21, March 1, Apr. 7, 21, 1880.



struggle, "...for the Narrow Gauge Railroad fight in Portland is our fight for cheap transportation."<sup>23</sup> The more bitter the reaction, then, when the board in Dundee, for a steady rental of seven per cent on the invested capital, sold out to Villard who assimilated the new road to his own system.<sup>24</sup> Reid, backed by the farmers, later completed the scheme, but the good relations between Oregon and Dundee were destroyed.<sup>25</sup> Though a shrewd business man, he united his fortunes with those of the Pacific Northwest in a way that directors sitting in Scotland could not. One of them had earlier visited the area, was impressed by its riches, and perceived the desirability of a new line of communication with California. Yet he had participated in this deal which could have impaired the brilliant future he foresaw, and blighted the hopes of the farmers.<sup>26</sup> After the lease had been abrogated, he lamented the "American Repudiation of a British Investment" without an apparent perception of any other circumstance than the failure of the rent.<sup>27</sup> Absentee investors, like absentee landlords, could seldom identify themselves with the interests of those upon whom ultimately the fate of their venture depended.

Often, then, the prime requisite for successful and happy relations was lacking on both sides. Yet, even if British enterprises behaved as any American capitalistic concern would, and even if their activities were not such as to press upon every one of the exposed nerves of western agrarian anti-British feeling, their British character could never be forgotten, and it embittered any conflict. The building of irrigation works on the High Plains in the 1880's provided a rich matrix in which these animosities might luxuriate.

The greater scale of construction enforced by earlier ditch building and by the increased settlement during the 1870's made irrigation more of a corporative and speculative and less of an individual or co-operative undertaking.<sup>28</sup> The separa-

tion of control of water and control of land to be irrigated, raised the question whether the ditch owner was a common carrier or whether the ownership of the ditch conferred proprietary rights over the water upon the company. Farmers vehemently claimed that once water had been turned onto a piece of land a perpetual right to so much water inhered thenceforward in that land. Furthermore, if it was humanly possible for the corporation to direct water onto any land it must do so if requested, just as railways could not refuse to transport commodities. For this service the charge should be a moderate one, to cover the actual cost of transporting the water. The ditch companies protested that by their labor they had appropriated the water, and therefore they could sell or withhold it. Besides, they were in the business for a living, and having sometimes incurred large expenses for building, required the power to make a sufficient initial charge for the right to use their water, and a regular rate adequate to cover depreciation and costs. Farmers' co-operative ditches were cheap to operate; but farmers forgot that corporation ditches were bigger, more elaborate, demanded more expensive upkeep and expert staffs, and that corporations were obliged to pay dividends to investors.<sup>29</sup>

Since these corporations were land owners, charges of land-monopoly inevitably sharpened the long drawn-out squabbles. Controlling the water, they could put their own value on the soil they possessed, and, if all their pretensions were admitted, they could exert powerful pressure on proprietors of near-by land which needed irrigation.<sup>30</sup> The situation was complicated when these corporations added to their other functions those of money lenders. A farmer in order to pay the initial heavy charges for land and water was compelled to mortgage his farm to the company of whom he was purchasing land and water-rights. The company disclaimed all responsibility if, in the event of drought, it could not provide

<sup>23</sup> Oregon, *House Journal*, 11 Sess. (Oct. 7, 1880), 183.

<sup>24</sup> *Portland Oregonian*, March 6, 1889.

<sup>25</sup> The Scottish directors went so far as to accuse Reid of misappropriating the farmers' contributions. Oregon, *Senate Journal*, 13 Sess. (Feb. 11, 1885) 331.

<sup>26</sup> John Leng, *America in 1876* (Dundee, 1877), 26-8, 118-43. He became prominent in the British newspaper world, was knighted, and on his third trip to the United States died in California in 1906.

<sup>27</sup> *The Economist*, 42: 784-5 (June 28, 1884).

<sup>28</sup> Between 1880 and 1890 there was quite a specula-

tive boom, analogous to the contemporary one in western real estate. U. S. Census Office. 12th Census, 1900, Vol. 6, *Agriculture*, Pt. 2, *Crops and Irrigation*, 801.

<sup>29</sup> It was claimed that the annual cost of irrigation to farmers owning their own canal was a tenth of that charged by the English company in Colorado. *Rocky Mountain News*, March 15, 1887.

<sup>30</sup> This control over water could "leave the Colorado farmer in the position of a peon or a tenant." *Rocky Mountain News*, Feb. 9, 1891.



the usual allocation. Nevertheless, should the crops fail as a result and the farmer default, the company foreclosed on the property.<sup>31</sup>

By the 1880's there was a network of canals, which, extensive but unplanned, failed to effect the full and economic use of the water.<sup>32</sup> As the law was still inexact, quarrels over water rights were chronic. Drought exacerbated this strife. When the ditch gates had to be closed the corporation was a convenient scapegoat. Sometimes in a general way such hostility might be well directed, for the boom in corporative irrigation construction in the 1880's contributed largely to the eccentricities of the ditch system. On the other hand these accusations in specific instances might be unjustified, for the orders of state officials, or subsequent building, or unprecedented drought might be to blame.

These conditions prevailed in all the irrigated regions of the West.<sup>33</sup> In Colorado, which by 1900 had the largest irrigated area of any state, attempts had been made to deal with conflicting rights as early as 1861. The Colorado State Grange had declared its wishes in 1875 but the constitution of the following year was open to differing interpretations.<sup>34</sup> Legislation in 1879 and 1881 founded the State administrative system and schemes of measurement of rivers and ditches. However, it distributed water priorities by date of canal construction not by the date of irrigation of the land, thus putting the emphasis in adjudicating rights on canal-ownership rather than

on the use of water. Some problems had been clarified, but others remained obscure.<sup>35</sup>

The Colorado Mortgage and Investment Company, organised in London in 1879, in the early 1880's built the High Line canal, eighty-three miles long, at the cost of \$640,000. This canal came out of the Platte just south of Denver, watering the land to the east of the city within the most important irrigation area in Colorado, and within a long way of the State capitol. Moreover, the "company," as it was termed, was much in the public eye through the activities of subsidiary companies. These built other irrigation ditches, engaged in brick manufacture, erected business blocks and the famous Windsor hotel, and lent money on mortgages. Men connected with it, such as James Barclay, M.P., James Duff, the general manager, and State Senator Freeman, were prominent.<sup>36</sup> Its British character does not appear to have made its operations in any way distinct from those of an American company. Yet its nationality became of prime importance in the recrimination it excited.

Drought at the height of the irrigating season in July 1886 brought to a head latent hostility expressed by the Grange in 1881.<sup>37</sup> Ranchmen and farmers dependent on water from the South Platte complained that they were near ruin owing to the scarcity of water, whilst the ditch of the English company was full. Tempers grew hot; in public

<sup>31</sup> Frederick H. Newell, *Report on Agriculture by Irrigation in the Western Part of the United States at the Eleventh Census* (Washington, 1894), 94. An accusation to this effect was flung at the English company in Colorado. *Rocky Mountain News*, Feb. 28, 1887.

<sup>32</sup> Many of these received British capital. Elwood Mead, *Irrigation Institutions* (New York, 1903), 344-5. Mead deals with the difficulties created by corporate enterprise, 344-65.

<sup>33</sup> In Costilla County, south Colorado, "There is, as a matter of course, more or less friction between the smaller irrigators and the large canal companies, the latter being denounced as oppressive monopolies, and some of the former characterized as ignorant and wasteful in their use of water." Newell, *Agriculture by Irrigation*, 107. There was trouble in California and a special session of the state legislature. The law of 1887 was influential in other states. John W. Caughy, *California* (New York, 1940), 444-50.

<sup>34</sup> D. W. Working, "The Colorado State Grange: Historical Address," in Colorado State Grange, *Journal of Proceedings*, 1924, p. 30.

<sup>35</sup> Robert G. Dunbar, "The Origin of the Colorado System of Water-Right Control," *Colorado Magazine*, 27: 251-4, 258 (Oct., 1950). The law was so vague that the officials had difficulty in adjudication. Colorado State Engineer, *Biennial Report 1880-2*, p. 22.

<sup>36</sup> It was well known that the investors and managers of these subsidiaries were practically identical. For the Colorado Brick Manufacturing Company see *Denver Tribune*, July 22, 1890. For the Windsor Hotel see Lewis C. Gandy, *The Tabors* (New York, 1934), 215. For land and canals see *Prospectus of the Colorado Mortgage and Investment Company* (London, 1879); Alvin R. Steinel, *History of Agriculture in Colorado* (Fort Collins, 1926), 202-4; *Irrigation Age* (Denver) 2: 469 (Feb. 1, 1892). For details of the High Line Canal see *Sanitary Engineer* (New York), 14: 225 (Aug. 5, 1886). See also Robert G. Dunbar, "Water Conflicts and Controls in Colorado," *Agricultural History*, 22: 180 (July, 1948).

<sup>37</sup> *Rocky Mountain News*, Jan. 13, 1881. "Representatives of the High Line Company say that they are usually made a target for all complaints as a monopoly and life is too short to reply to them all." *Denver Tribune Republican*, July 17, 1886.

meetings there was wild talk about the rapacity of "foreigners from over the sea," and there was a possibility of armed conflict with the company's employees guarding the gates. The company was denounced in unmeasured terms, the consensus being "that John Bull had lots of cheek, and that it seemed as if the old days of English tyranny were coming back."<sup>38</sup> It is true that currently farmers and working men were agitating against the abuse of power by their own wealthy compatriots. But in this case, folk memories of 1776, and the foreign element in the struggle made talk of rifles highly relevant.

The parties to the dispute met with the governor and the State engineer. Governor Eaton, in a potentially equivocal situation because of his past financial dependence on the English company during the building of the Larimer and Weld canal, disclaimed all "sympathy with tyranny, monopoly, or any foreign corporation," and won applause. To an excited audience, Gilmore, the manager of the High Line, explained that the company had prior rights and the real culprits were those who had built ditches recently. He was able to show that the level of the water in his canal had in fact been lowered substantially over the previous weeks, and since its large size made it particularly subject to seepage and evaporation, the volume of water in it could not be reduced below a certain minimum without being totally lost before the end of the canal was reached.<sup>39</sup>

At first the governor and the State engineer, no doubt swayed by the farmers' passion, reflected the animus against the English company. But gentle rain cooled tempers, Gilmore's facts were found to be correct, and his solution, to cut down the water of all ditches and not merely of his, was adopted. The State engineer, Nettleton, discovered that the complaints were largely unjustified.<sup>40</sup> The ditch owner did not exercise responsibility in dividing the waters, whilst farmers insisted on their "rights" at the expense of their suffering

fellows, even while they did not need the full amount. This was a common problem, for irrigators feared lest, if they surrendered water, their rights in the future would be proportionately weakened.<sup>41</sup> It was alleged that one of the most inveterate and loud-spoken vilifiers of the English company was one of the worst offenders in this way, at the very time he was denouncing the company to the governor.<sup>42</sup>

A more serious problem, which was not to be settled so easily, was already provoking dissension. In April 1886, the State Supreme Court refused jurisdiction in a case brought before it by Dr. Byron A. Wheeler against the English company.<sup>43</sup> Wheeler owned some land under the company's ditch. He had applied for water but he had refused to pay the initial charge of \$10 an acre demanded in addition to the annual levy and started litigation when the company denied him water.<sup>44</sup> This charge, ominously known as a "royalty," became more bitterly disputed as land about the canal was taken up. Water commissioners had been appointed by the State to fix annual rates, but the legitimacy of an initial charge was uncertain as it seemed to admit corporate pretensions to ownership of the water. How far the virulent attacks made on the company were justified it is hard to determine.<sup>45</sup> By the 1890's its business operations as a whole were not profitable. Comparison with native companies suggests that the payment of royalty was not exceptional,<sup>46</sup> and to what extent other concerns extorted comparable sums is uncertain.<sup>47</sup> The yearly rate fixed

<sup>38</sup> U. S. Census office. 12th Census, 1900, *Crops and Irrigation*, 814.

<sup>39</sup> *Colorado Farmer and Livestock Journal*, July 22, 1886.

<sup>40</sup> *Reports of the Supreme Court of Colorado*, 9: 256-7 (1886).

<sup>41</sup> *Colorado Farmer and Livestock Journal*, Sept. 30, 1886.

<sup>42</sup> It was reckoned, by a hostile critic, that the royalties alone, which it demanded for water rights, would exceed the cost of construction by \$350,000 at the lowest estimate. *Rocky Mountain News*, Feb. 28, 1887.

<sup>43</sup> The other big Colorado system, the Travelers' Insurance in the San Luis valley, apparently made the same preliminary charge for selling water rights, A Kansas canal made an initial charge of \$15 an acre. Newell, *Agriculture by Irrigation*, 121, 276.

<sup>44</sup> On the average Colorado seems to have been served by cheaper irrigation than other states, but the value of its irrigated crops was also below the average. The English company's charges were probably above the

<sup>38</sup> *Denver Tribune Republican*, July 13, 16, 17, 1886.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, July 16, 17, 1886.

<sup>40</sup> State Engineer Nettleton believed the farmers would soon be "ashamed" of their outcry. *Ibid.*, July 20, 1886. The exaggerations about the water scarcity were deprecated as harmful to Colorado's hopes of capital and immigration, but were put down to the farmers' "intense animosity to the English Corporation." *Colorado Farmer and Livestock Journal* (Denver), July 22, 1886.

by commissioners hardly provided for upkeep. If dividends were to be paid the company had either to gouge the purchasers of its land, or to put some of the financial burden upon those who merely required water.<sup>48</sup> The services of the English company raised the value of land tremendously. Judge Belford, a constant critic of British western enterprise in Congress, and of the English company when in Colorado, had purchased lands under the ditch from the company, and within a couple of years had refused to sell at a greatly enhanced price.<sup>49</sup> Certainly the agitation of the farmers was ultimately so subversive of the interests of all, of whatever nationality, who transported water, that all, corporations or farmers' organisations, felt themselves threatened. The English company, however, as paradoxically both the strongest and the weakest, was singled out for attack.

Wheeler's court failure led to the formation of the Farmers' Irrigation and Protective Association in January 1887. It had close connections with the Grange, but there was little pretense throughout its career that it was more than a local affair, or directed at anything but the English company.<sup>50</sup> It introduced into the legislature a bill prohibiting the royalty levy. Pressure was exerted by both sides in and out of the legislature from January through March 1887.<sup>51</sup> The State Grange reported

state average, but the lands under it, being near the city, were correspondingly more valuable. The annual charge was low for a corporation in Colorado, and in the United States as a whole twice as much was often demanded. *Ibid.*, 6, 8, 9, 90.

<sup>48</sup> The census reporters of 1900 believed that speculative enterprises in irrigation had helped to extend irrigation but had not enriched the investors. The annual value of the crops was much more than the cost of irrigation construction. U. S. Census Office, 12th Census, *Crops and Irrigation*, 801, 821.

<sup>49</sup> Belford refused to sell in 1887 for \$26.31 an acre land which he had bought in 1884 at \$9. *Denver Republican*, July 11, 1890. Irrigated land in Colorado was worth far more by 1899. U. S. Census Office, 12th Census, *Crops and Irrigation*, 834.

<sup>50</sup> *Rocky Mountain News*, Jan. 7, 1887. The leader of the Grange, Levi Booth, had his farm on Cherry Creek, in the area affected by these disputes. *Denver Post*, Aug. 14, 1904.

<sup>51</sup> Colorado, *House Journal*, 6 Sess., 253, 500, 985-8, 1096, 2263. The House Committee listened attentively to the farmers' association. *Rocky Mountain News*, Jan. 21, 1887.

gleefully that a senator was heard to remark "wherever he went, in or out of the Senate Chamber, at his hotel when he was partaking his meals, or at the bar for his drinks, or in the smoking room with his cigar, and even when in bed, Bro. Strong was ever present whispering in his ear, 'Anti-Royalty! Anti-Royalty.'" <sup>52</sup> It was suggested that influences emanated from the company, almost as persuasive, but somehow less manly and honest.<sup>53</sup> The bill was generally recognised as the second most important of the session, attracting the largest crowds to the assembly. Both Democratic and Republican papers supported it.

The alien origin of the company was constantly exposed by zealous propagandists. Confessedly the bill was aimed at the English company, and also at its alleged "foreign methods of doing business."<sup>54</sup> Some argued that the bill would harm everybody in the State except the English company, as it had no more water rights to sell. Most chanted Judge Barnum's credo, "The idea of a royalty upon water was un-American. It was not the idea of an American brain or American heart."<sup>55</sup> By the time the bill passed through the House and came to be considered by the Senate, the issue was simple. "Gentlemen of the Senate, are you for English royalties or for the rights of American farmers?" Wisely for their political futures, though in the face of some opposition and obstruction, the majority decided they were against the English company, and Governor Alva Adams, who had broached the subject in his inaugural, signed the bill.<sup>56</sup> At the end of the year the State

<sup>52</sup> The Worthy Master's Address in Colorado State Grange, *Journal of Proceedings*, 1888, p. 23.

<sup>53</sup> Company officials were said to have disguised themselves as farmers in spreading their malignant propaganda. The Democratic paper descanted on the "bitter and truculent opposition" and "the grossest misrepresentation" and the "larceny of water" by the English company "which is the head and front of the opposition to the bill." *Rocky Mountain News*, March 11, Feb. 8, 1887.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, March 2, 1887. Appropriate appeals were made to the Boston Tea Party. *Ibid.*, March 8, 1887.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, March 3, 1887.

<sup>56</sup> One who voted against the bill was careful to state that "... he did not like the English or their ways. He was born in this country and was an American." *Ibid.*, March 30, 1887. It was a smear to be associated by political opponents with the English Company. See cartoon in *ibid.*, Jan. 7, 1887.

Supreme Court heard Wheeler's case and found against the company.<sup>57</sup>

The situation remained unstable. In the course of the struggle the pervasive interests of the English company were pointed out. It had unpatented land of the Kansas Pacific railroad, it owned canals, buildings. It even provided the committee rooms and legislative chambers for the assembly, for which it drew substantial fees from the State treasury. As an alien it escaped taxation, but quickly resorted to American courts to enforce a foreclosure.<sup>58</sup> Retribution so far seemed hardly to fit the crime. Nor was the basic problem of irrigation changed. The capacity of the ditches and the hopes of the farmers were too large for the actual quantity of water under the prevailing haphazard system of construction and apportionment.<sup>59</sup>

The next drought brought forth similar conflicts of equal intensity. In July 1890, a "High Line Victim"—later identified as Judge Amos Steck—wrote complaining that the English company had supplied no water for weeks past, despite its obligations, which it had assumed even though it knew when the canal was built that there was insufficient water in the Platte from which to meet those commitments. Consequently, "every dollar it got was upon false pretenses."<sup>60</sup> The State engineer himself reported suffering under the High Line, and threats were made against the company when the commissioner closed the gates.<sup>61</sup> The harassed manager laid the blame on subsequent appropriation. Nor had the company profited, for in enriching others, it failed to meet its own expenses. People were too speedy in accusing the English company whenever anything went wrong. The superintendent had mistakenly ordered the

High Line's gate to be closed, and the real fault lay with the owners of canals of later priority, who refused to close their gates when the official tried to rectify his error.<sup>62</sup>

The pattern of events of 1890-1891 followed that of 1886-1887. Despite this defence, the Farmers' Irrigation and Protective Association was resuscitated and came to the forefront again during the legislative session. The State Grange wanted it made clear that ditches were common carriers, that the rights of carriage, appropriation, and use of the water were distinct and different, and that water used to irrigate land became a permanent property of that land. Actual bills introduced endeavoured to secure farmers' claims concretely: by lengthening the irrigation season to ten months of the year, by making payment terms easier and more contingent upon actual supply, and by reforming the system of measurement. Support for the farmers was less unanimous than in 1887. There was criticism that the proposed legislation invidiously penalised corporations, and warnings were uttered that investors would not stand more pressure upon them, and that capital would take wings.<sup>63</sup> This caution was pertinent, for a movement was afoot to repeal the State anti-absentee alien legislation of 1887. Trouble with the English company would hardly contribute to a successful culmination.

The legislation did not go through. All irrigation interests found themselves threatened equally with the English company. The spokesmen of the others—this time the chief devil remained discreetly behind the scenes—did not concede any special guilt on the part of the English company, but were at one in charging that the main-spring of the bill was only the little group in the Association. They were a lot of "soreheads" moved only by their hatred of the English company.<sup>64</sup> Wheeler denied this, and asserted they were activated by no particular malice. The redoubtable Senator Steck, however, who introduced the chief irrigation measure of the session, and who was also one of the few to vote against the repeal of

<sup>57</sup> *Reports of the Supreme Court of Colorado*, 10: 584-99. This was regarded as a triumph for Colorado's future growth. *Denver Journal of Commerce*, Jan. 12, 1888.

<sup>58</sup> *Rocky Mountain News*, March 3, 1887.

<sup>59</sup> Agitation was already afoot for Federal aid in the construction of reservoirs to store flood waters. *Engineering and Building Record* (New York), 17: 193 (Feb. 25, 1888) and 17: 317 (Nov. 24, 1888). Another suggestion was that it be stipulated that canals be handed over to the users, after private construction. Colorado State Engineer, *Biennial Report*, 1886-8, p. 415.

<sup>60</sup> *Denver Republican*, July 1, 1890.

<sup>61</sup> Colorado State Engineer, *Biennial Report*, 1888-90, p. 11.

<sup>62</sup> *Denver Republican*, July 11, 1890.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 16, Feb. 5, 7, 24, 1891. Earlier agitation had cancelled British plans on the Arkansas river. Steinel, *Agriculture in Colorado*, 208.

<sup>64</sup> Small canal owners objected to being ruined because of this "spite" against the English company. *Denver Republican*, Feb. 25, 26, 1891. *Rocky Mountain News*, Feb. 7, 1891.



the 1887 legislation prohibiting the ownership of real property by absentee aliens, bluntly imputed to the English company sole responsibility for the trouble.<sup>65</sup> In a special sense this was true.

Thenceforward the English company loomed less importantly on the Colorado scene. Between 1890 and 1900 the scope of Colorado's irrigation system doubled, and the Farmers' Association projected a network of its own to make up for the alleged deficiencies of the High Line.<sup>66</sup> The Grange turned to more general solutions. It was attracted by the Californian law which would obviate dependence on private enterprise.<sup>67</sup> In common with other mortgage corporations, the English company suffered in the early 1890's, when the prices of its securities slumped. By the end of the century it was dubious whether it could pay a dividend.<sup>68</sup> Most responsible for the easing of tension was the prevalence of good rainy seasons during the 1890's.

What the farmers were suffering from in 1886-1887 and 1890-1891 was drought, an unplanned irrigation system, a weak state supervision, the irresponsible assertion of rights by various parties, and non-cooperation on the part of many individuals. Some of these factors were quite out of the purview of the Colorado Mortgage and Invest-

ment Company; in some cases it was blameworthy along with others. Its size and influence made it an especially tempting target in that age of unrest and of hostility to the new corporate power. Its nearness to the capital city brought it within the glare of publicity. Yet it was its alien, its British, character which gave asperity to the conflict, and made it the unwilling cynosure of attention. Again and again the epithet "British" was used as if it were a swear word. The newspapers contained occasional hostile stories about the other ditch companies, about the disposal of the City Ditch, or the Travelers' Insurance canal system in the San Luis valley, but these lacked the zest that was evoked by the English company.<sup>69</sup>

British capital in general was welcome, and favorable things were said even of the English company in Colorado.<sup>70</sup> Yet the ambivalence of western attitudes towards eastern capital was repeated and intensified regarding British enterprise, and colored with overtones from rich stores of hostility not drawn upon when a Jay Gould was contemplated. Money was desirable, outside control, particularly alien, was resented.

<sup>65</sup> *Rocky Mountain News*, March 10, 1887. *Field and Farm* (Denver), Feb. 21, 1891.

<sup>70</sup> The part that Duff's assistant had played in helping "to build up the city" was acknowledged. *Denver Tribune Republican*, Jan. 20, 1885. In some quarters it was allowed that the companies had played a useful part in Colorado's development. *Irrigation Age*, 2: 469 (Feb. 1, 1892). Enthusiasm was expressed, too, over reports of the start of the ill-fated Elephant Butte project. *Rocky Mountain News*, Sept. 30, 1896.

<sup>66</sup> Colorado, *Senate Journal*, 8 Sess. (1891), 1029, 1296.

<sup>67</sup> *Denver Republican*, Jan. 29, 1891.

<sup>68</sup> Colorado State Grange, *Journal of Proceedings*, 1893, p. 68.

<sup>69</sup> *The Economist*, 49: 4 (Jan. 3, 1891). *Anglo-Colorado Mining and Milling Guide*, 1: 88 (July, 1898).

## THE VICAR OF MATTISHALL AND HIS TITHES, 1781-1803

M. F. LLOYD PRICHARD

*Cambridge, England*

In the January 1926 issue of *Economic History*, J. A. Venn wrote an article entitled "The Economy of a Norfolk Parish in 1783 and at the Present Time." The parish was Mattishall and the material for 1783 was taken from a notebook preserved in the treasury of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Therein the Vicar, the Reverend John Smith, incumbent from 1781 to 1803, had written a detailed account of the size of landholdings, yield of crops, tithes, local rates, and national taxation.

The discovery of two more such notebooks in the

church chest at Mattishall, which Venn did not find in his "personal investigation on the spot"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The church chest at Mattishall apparently lay unexplored for many years for when the Charity Commissioners were seeking particulars of the Mattishall charities, those replying failed to make the other fortunate discovery which I made of a bundle of sixteenth-century papers. Among those papers was found an interesting Elizabethan letter which would have told them that the charity, attributed by them to Robert Harleston, was the gift of his sister Mrs.

throws more light on the subject since they give further data from 1781 onwards of holdings, tithes, tithe agreements, local rates, etc. The matter relating to tithes is of the greatest interest.

Before examining the tithes, let us see what other income accrued to the vicar from his living. This can be arrived at from his own analysis of the houses, glebe, and lands belonging to Mattishall.

Houses, glebe, and Rectory lands belonging to the Rectory of Mattishall, situated in that and the adjoining parish of Bergh were listed as follows in 1781:

<i>Description</i>	<i>Let to</i>	<i>£</i>	<i>Rent s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1. A Vicarage house, hay house and yard.	Wm. Dade	5	0	0
2. A piece of land on south side of vicg.	Jno. Hubbard		5	0
3. In Thos. Hutson's yard one piece of land.	Thos. Hutson		3	4
4. A piece of land in Thos. Hewit's Clay Pit close; one large rood in the same close; 2 pieces of land in Thos. Hewit's 12 acre close; half an acre on the east side of Thos. Hewit's 9 acre close; in High Field half an acre next to the Town land; 1 acre more west; 6 pieces of land in Bergh, nearly 6 roods.	Thos. Hewit	6	0	0
5. In the next Furlong more north of High Field, half an acre. <sup>2</sup>	Unknown			Unknown
6. In J. Chambers' Broom Close 2 pieces, 1½ acres.	Geo. Bowles		10	0
7. In Parsonage Close half an acre and the Parsonage Close.	R. Baker	5	0	0
8. One large rood in Young's Hoes Close.	T. Broadbank		4	6
9. 3 roods in Beckgate Field.	J. Petchel		15	0
10. 1 rood in Mary Boutell's close.	Harvey Watts		5	0
11. One rood in a close of Geo. Schutz.	James Sofly			Unknown
12. 2 acres next the Heath.	Wm. Edwards		15	0
13. Half an acre in Henry Conold's close.	J. Manning		5	0
		19	8	10

Parker, wife of Archbishop Parker. The neglect was not surprising. The chest was in such a state of disorder that on the arrival of the present incumbent, the parishioners begged him to allow them to burn "the old rubbish" so that he might have "a nice clean chest." Dr. Venn, who kindly read this article in manuscript, tells me that on his visit to Mattishall he did not see the incumbent, but a churchwarden informed him that there was no church chest.

<sup>2</sup> The terrier of 1806 states, "The Vicar has been

In addition, a cottage called Bashes was let to Edward Gurling for £1 a year plus small manorial dues of 1/3. This brings the total to £20.10.1. There was also a farm at Stanfield consisting of 40 acres let from 1781 to 1785 at £42 a year. No details are given for later years except a comment that, "the trees upon the estate were numbered April 23rd. 1794 and amounted to 133 Timbers and 309 Pollards, the former of which were all very small at the time,"<sup>3</sup> and "September 24th. 1789. Agreed with Mr. Ambrose Syer for the farm at Stanfield at the rent of £1 per acre from Mich

deprived of this half acre of glebe for many years upon account of his not having been able to ascertain the lands adjoining to it on the East and West." A further note says, "As an exchange of lands took place at the time of the Inclosure this half acre is irrecoverably gone."

<sup>3</sup> Timbers—large heavy trees capable of being made into timber. Pollards are lopped trees. The vicar comments one year: "N.B. John Bennett by lease granted from Mich. 1796 is to have the lops of a twelfth part

1798 according to a Mensuration that should be taken of it by a person whom I shall appoint for that purpose. It was moreover agreed that the Lease should be drawn out by myself he paying for the Stamps and parchment." In addition there was a farm at Attleborough explained as follows by the terrier of 1740: "There was left by Queen Anne of glorious Memory and lately given to the Vicarage of Mattishall the sum of £200 and other £200 with which £400 an Estate was purchased at Attleborough . . . of the yearly value of £23."<sup>4</sup> The rent was £28 a year from 1781-1785. Thus the vicar obtained £90.10.1 from land and buildings in the possession of the living.

The vicar proceeded immediately to raise the rents wherever possible. "Nearly agreed August 26th. 1782 with Mr. Broadbank for 10s. a year." The account for Michaelmas 1783 shows that Thomas Broadbank paid 10s. for the rent of the glebe. The rent of William Edwards' land was increased from 15s. to £1.6s. from Michaelmas 1781. In 1789 the Vicar notes that he let the Parsonage House to William Francis for £8 a year, "... he engaging to pay the Land Tax every quarter for the Rectory being allowed it again upon the payment of his Rent and engaging likewise to pay at his own expense the window and house duty, half the Poor's Rate for the House and Close and likewise half the Highway Duty for ditto." But an immediate difficulty arose. "N.B. The collector of the Poor's Rate took the payment of Francis for half a year to Midsummer 1790 but recollecting that he thereby made him an inhabitant, he returned it to him again and received it of me and it was then agreed that I should pay it for the future and add it to the rent at the end of the year."

The main income of the vicar came, however, from tithes. The average number of tithe payers was 55 from 1780 to 1788 but then dropped to 43. The vicar invited to the annual audit every person "who paid above 10s." and the annual bill for entertainment of the gathering varies little from the following:

*Tithe Entertainment at the Swan  
December 1st, 1788*

	£	s.	d.
Butcher's bill.....	2.	0.	3.
Wine.....		13.	6.
Punch.....	3.	0.	0.
Beer, rum and water.....	1.	6.	0.
Sundries.....	1.	8.	8.
	8.	8.	5.

The number of tithe payers who paid less than 10s. dropped during the years as the following table shows:

	To Michaelmas, 1781	To Michaelmas, 1783	To Michaelmas, 1789
Up to 10s.....	20	15	4
10s to £1.....	10	12	1
£1 to £3.....	14	10	14
£3 to £5.....	2	5	6
£5 to £10.....	6	4	4
£10 and over.....	6	7	14

In the year ending Michaelmas 1781, the amount paid by 58 tithe payers was £167.6.4. Small increases in the tithe paid by each debtor took place in the year ending 1782. The vicar reports with satisfaction in one account: "N.B. John Edwards confessed that his piece of arable land called an acre produced 15 combs of Barley this year." Further reassessments followed the next year, and in 1783 the vicar gives a systematic review of the potential value of his tithes. The report begins, "I shall endeavour to ascertain the quantity of each of them which is produced here, *communibus annis* and their average values as they are sold in the neighbouring market." He divided the land into two parts, arable and pasture:

Here are 1055 acres 3 roods and 9 perches of arable land, 260 acres of which being sown with turnips may be valued at £2.10s. an acre and at this price amount to £650 and consequently the tithes to £65. Another part sown with barley and oats contains about 230 acres of the former and 70 of the latter. The barley at 7 combs per acre and 8s. a comb which are a fair average of the quantity and price, is worth £644; and the oats at 8 combs an acre and 7s. a comb are worth £196 and the tithes of both together amount to £84. Another part containing about 225 acres sown with peas clover and nonsuch. The two latter are worth about £3 an acre, and the peas producing *communibus annis* 5 combs an acre and the average price being 12 s. a comb are worth likewise £3 an acre. The produce thereof of these 225 acres at this valuation being £675 the tithes amount to £67.10s.0. The remaining shift containing about 240 acres is sown with wheat which will produce one year with another 5 combs per acre

of the Pollards amounting in all to about 250 the twelfth part of which is about 20 set out each year."

<sup>4</sup>According to the terrier of 1753, the gift was augmented by an additional loan of £200, free of interest, by Dr. Gooch, Bishop of Norwich. A grant of £200 from the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty enabled the vicar to purchase the estate at Stanfield. This loan was repaid by Dr. Goodall, predecessor of the Rev. John Smith.

and will sell for at least 18s. a comb. The value of this crop according to this estimate being £1080 that of the tithes amounts to £108. The remaining 30 acres 3 roods and 9 perches which are not included in this calculation are laid down with a second years crop of clover and nonsuch. But this being chiefly if not altogether eaten by cows or sheep pays not other than what is due from the produce of those animals.

Of the pasture land he says that it

... contains about 364 acres and about one fifth ... is reserved for hay. This amounting nearly to 75 acres will produce *communibus annis* £3 of Hay an acre which at 2s. a hundred make the whole worth £225 and the tithe will consequently come to £2.10.0. The remainder of the pasture and the aftergrass of that which is mowed is fed to cows, sheep, young stock and the Horses used in husbandry. The three first of which are tithable and may be valued at the following rates.

The produce of a cow, consisting of the milk and calf may be fairly estimated at £6 a year. At this valuation, the number of cows kept in the parish being about 160, the profit arising from them comes to £960 and the tithe to £96.

In the following year the vicar tells us of local practice with regard to cows. "It is customary for Farmers in this part of Norfolk to let out their cows. The person who hires them has the milk and the farmer who lets them maintains them and has the calves." Other stock are also assessed:

The Farmers and other inhabitants who have a right of common keep about 800 sheep, of which 200 being ewes produce annually about the same number of lambs. These at 6s. each are worth £60 and the wool of the whole 800 sheep at 1s. and 6d. a fleece comes to £60; and both taken together amount to £120 and the tithe to £12.

The young stock in this parish, for which an agistment Tithe is due consist of Colts and Cattle bred for the Dairy or Butcher. The number of these is about 150. And the value of their keeping during such parts of the year as they are fed on the common or in the Farmers' pastures or shacked in his stubbles amounts to £1 per head. According to which estimation the Tithe of them comes to £15.

The Farmers and Cottagers bring up a great number of geese here, for which a Tithe is indisputably due. But besides those which are bred in the parish, there are many hundred brought up towards the end of Harvest from 1s. to 1s.3d. a piece and turned upon the stubbles for the benefit of the shackage; by which means they are improved to the amount of 1s. or 1s.6d. each. For this improvement a Tithe is certainly due as well as it is for the shackage of sheep or other stock. Upon the whole, I believe, the profit arising from the breeding and

improvement of geese in this parish does not amount to less than £50 and consequently the Tithe on this article comes to £5.

The number of pigs produced here annually is about 300; the tithe of which at 3d. a pig is £3.15s.

Here are about 70 orchards and gardens which may be laid one with another at £1 each; and at this valuation the Tithe arising from them comes to £7.

Here is also a Tithe due for Honey of which no inconsiderable quantity is produced in this parish; but what the value of it may amount to I am by no means able to determine.

The vicar then proceeds to bring the whole into what he calls "one point of view" as follows:

Valuation of Rectory	Tithes		
	£	s.	d.
Barley 230 acres at 7c. and 8s. £644.....	64.	8.	0
Oats 70 acres at 8c. and 7s. £196..	19.	12.	0
Peas clover and nonsuch 225 acres at £3 £675.....	67.	10.	0
Wheat 240 acres at 5c. and 18s. £1080.....	108.	0.	0
Hay 75 acres at £3. £225.....	22.	10.	0
	£282.	0.	0.

Valuation of the Vicarage <sup>5</sup>	Tithes		
	£	s.	d.
Turnips 260 acres at £2.10s. £650	65.	0.	0
Cows 160 at £6 each £960.....	96.	0.	0
Sheep 800 at 1s.6d. each for wool £60.....	6.	0.	0
Ewes 200 at 6s. each for lambs £60.....	6.	0.	0
Young stock 150 at £1 each £150.	15.	0.	0
Young geese 500 at 1s. each £25..	2.	10.	0
Do. shacked 500 at 1s. each £25..	2.	10.	0
Pigs 300 at 2s.6d. each £37.10s...	3.	15.	0
Orchards and gardens 70 at £1 each £70.....	7.	0.	0
Honey £40.....	4.	0.	0
	£207.	15.	0
Total.....	£489.	15.	0

Fresh agreements were speedily made with the parishioners and fresh measurements made of their land to obtain the desired results. The vicar on December 1, 1783, "agreed with Mr. Male for his Tithes of 5 acres, 3 roods, and 22 perches of land at one pound from Mich. last but told him I would abate him 3s. for the first year. N.B. This

<sup>5</sup> The Vicarage of Mattishall was consolidated with Pattesley Rectory Michaelmas, 1784.



is the same land that was before estimated at 4 acres 3r." He continues: "Dec. 15, 1783. Agreed with F. Davy for the Tithe of the Fruit of his Orchard at a Bushel of good Beefins every year from Mich. 1784."<sup>6</sup> The following year: "Dec. 5, 1784. Agreed with Mr. Manning for his Tithes for 4 years from Mich. 1784 at £2.16s.0 he paying poor and highway rates."

In December 1787 an interesting draft of an agreement for tithes with 8 farmers is recorded. The agreement was to continue until Michaelmas, 1792, "provided Mr. Smith shall so long remain vicar of Mattishall and Lessee of the great Tithes of the parish." The agreement reads:

Mr. — is to pay £— a year for the Tithes of the lands he now occupies in Mattishall on every first Monday in December . . . he is to pay likewise all the Poor Rates, Highway and all other Rates and Duties whatsoever, the Land Tax only excepted, that shall become due . . . on account of the said Tithes.

Mr. — is to bring Mr. Smith a chalders and a half of coals from Norwich free of all expense for carriage and at such time as shall be most convenient to Mr. — between the first of June and old Michaelmas Day in the year.

Mr. Smith is not to be obliged to receive any Boy or Girl sent out of the House of Industry to the Parish of Mattishall as an apprentice or servant or to pay any sum of money to be excused from taking such Boy or Girl that may be so sent upon account of the Tithes, Glebe or any other land that he now doth or may hereafter occupy during the said term of 4 years.

The agreement was to become void of course if the tenant ceased to hold the land or if change was made in the assessment of the vicarage, rectory or glebe lands to Land Tax, Poor Rates, Highway Rates, or other rate or tax or if Mr. Smith was absent from the parish longer than the law allowed and was prosecuted for non-residence.

To convince the tithe payers, Mr. Smith says that:

he flatters himself that Mr. — will not think any of these conditions unreasonable. If he should he makes no doubt that the following state of the composition

<sup>6</sup> Payment in kind was not uncommon. At Michaelmas, 1782, F. Davy paid, "in kind wheat 3 bus. and cash." See also the agreements cited above made in 1787. Contrast this with Mr. Venn's statement, "... cash payments were accepted in all cases, and ... tithing in kind was not practiced." Venn, "The Economy of a Norfolk Parish," *Economic History*, 1: 85 (Jan. 1926).

made with his parishioners will induce him to view it in a more favourable light. By this it will appear that the whole amount of what he receives from all of them falls rather short of the value of the small Tithes only; and that after paying a rent of near £40 a year for the great Tithes which arise from about 650 acres of grain of different kinds he in fact receives nothing for them. He however begs leave to assure Mr. — that he adds this state of the case only from a desire to convince him that his terms are perfectly reasonable and moderate and not with the least intention of expressing his disapprobation of them. He well knows what he has done and is satisfied with it; and the greater the advantages which the Farmers receive from the Bargain, so long as they appear sensible of it, the greater will be the pleasure arising from it to himself!

Value of the small Tithes	Tithes		
	£.	s.	d.
Turnips 200 acres at £2.10 an acre			
£500.....	50.	0.	0
Clover, nonsuch and hay, 200 acres			
at £3. £600.....	60.	0.	0
160 cows at £5 each, £800.....	80.	0.	0
800 sheep at 1s.6d. each for wool			
£60.....	6.	0.	0
400 lambs at 6s. each, £120.....	12.	0.	0
Pasturage of 100 young sheep at £1			
each, £100.....	10.	0.	0
Fruit etc. of 60 gardens and or-			
chards at £1 each, £60.....	6.	0.	0
Pigs, geese, fowls, etc., £50.....	5.	0.	0
	£229.	0.	0
Compositions received from farmers			
and other occupiers.....	226.	4.	4
Excess of the value of the small			
tithes above the composition re-			
ceived by Mr. S. for the whole			
parish for both great and small..	£ 2.	15.	8.

In later tithe agreements there is a hint of farming methods in Mattishall.

January 7th. 1803. Let to Mr. G. Smith my allotment on Badley Moor containing 3a.1r.35p. at £6.6s. a year from Mich. 1802, he agreeing after taking two crops of corn in 1803 and 1804 to cultivate it in the usual manner practised in Mattishall and the neighbouring parishes. That is to say with turnips in 1805, barley or oats in 1806, clover in 1807 and wheat in 1808 and to persevere in that course as long as he shall continue to occupy it, during which time he is to lay a proper quantity of manure either in the Clover layer, the Wheat or on the Fallow previous to its being sowed with Turnips.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See Venn, pp. 77-78 for another extract which gives a longer account of farming practice. Note too

The chief interest of the tithe accounts and agreements for the purpose of this article lies, however, in the increased payments which Mr. Smith was able to obtain from his parishioners. The increase enabled him to say in 1793 that his living was more valuable by £100 than it was in 1783. Figures are available for the years 1780 to 1789 which show precisely the increase.

	Total Tithes		
	£	s.	d.
1780-81	167.	6.	4
1782-83	191.	18.	8
1783-84	539.	19.	6
1785-86	456.	4.	4
1786-87	566.	2.	3
1787-88	576.	14.	11½
1788-89	576.	10.	9

Writing in 1793, Mr. Smith says:

Thus should it please God to grant me a few years continuance of life and health, I hope to be able to leave to my successors a tolerably clear and satisfactory account of the value of this living; and to prove that tho' it formerly was for a long time despised and more than once, I believe, refused by all the Foundation Fellows of Caius College, it is but little, if at all, inferior to the best preferment in the patronage of that Society.

What was the material effect from the parishioners' point of view? An analysis of the payments in practically every case indicates a large increase, allowing for changes in prices, in the amount of tithes paid after 1782 and is accounted for in the main by an increase in the number of articles tithable. It is of interest to follow the fortunes of one of the farmers, Mr. Edwards, named in the agreement of December 1787. His case is typical of the other debtors.

In the year 1780-81 he paid a tithe of £6.8.9 on 51 acres, 2 roods; in 1781-82 he paid £7.8.6 for 45 acres, 6 roods of arable and 6 acres of pasture land. But in the year 1783-84 the accounting was weighty and detailed as follows: (See table page 147.) By 1788 this tithe had increased to £26.6.9½.

Tithes were of course not the only dues exacted, and interesting figures are given for 1782 showing the assessments to different taxes. The following table summarises the data showing the tax, number of persons assessed, rate of tax, and the amount realised.

	No. of persons assessed 1782	Amount
Highway duty . . . .	139 at 2/- a head in most cases	£23. 9.3
Lights . . . . .	75 at varying rates	43.19.4
Land Tax . . . . .	84 at 4/- in the £	204. 0.0
Inhabited House Duty . . . . .	37 at 6d. in the £	6.17.0
Poor Rate (Quarter) . . . . .	79 at 1/3 in the £	58.19.4

On the Poor Rate, the vicar comments in 1782, "Mattishall pays to the House every quarter £46.12.6. According to the best calculation I can make, the Rents as they are laid in the Poor rate amount to two thirds of the rack rents, and the Land lets upon an average at about one pound per acre throughout the parish which contains 1308a. 3r.1p. according to the account delivered in to Dr. Goodall by the occupiers." Note that the computation made in 1783 by the new vicar made the total 1419a.3r.9p.

How was the individual affected by all these taxes? The following table shows the position of 3 parishioners of whom Mr. Edwards was one.\*

	Edwards	Gathercole	Hewit
Tithes to Mich. 1782	£7. 8.6.	6s.0.	17.3.0.
Highway Duty to Mich. 1782 . . . . .	3.0.	3s.0.	9.0.
Lights . . . . .	4.2.	4s.2.	1.4.0.
Inhabited House 1782-3 . . . . .	2.6.	2s.6.	—
Land Tax 1782 . . . . .	12.0.	10s.0.	8.0.0.
Poor Rate (Quarterly) April 1782 . . . . .	2. 0.0.	2s.6.	4.5.7½

For 1798 the vicar gives, in addition, the dues exacted for dogs and horses used in husbandry.

\* It is interesting to note these figures because of their nature and weight and also because Venn says, (p. 87) "... it is only after 1799 that Mr. Smith troubled to give a list of the payments rendered under the now familiar heads of property, window, vehicle, dog, manservant and inhabited house duties; such of these as existed in 1783 would have weighed lightly on agricultural producers." He gives however a total figure of £83.5.0. paid by the parish in poor rates in 1783 at ⅓ in the £ but this is actually the assessment made for May 10, 1798.

I am indebted to the Vicar of Mattishall Rev. T.G. Geddes and to the Bursar and Mr. Grierson of Gonville and Caius College for the loan of the tithe books and to Miss Chrystal of Newnham College for housing items in the Library safe.

his comment on the yield of turnips "from land which cannot have been manured." (p. 79). In the above case, however, due provision is apparently made.

Commodity	Combs per a.	Price per c.	Value	Acreage	Amt. Paid
Wheat.....	4.40	£1. 2.0	£44. 0.0	9a.3r.35p.	£4. 8.0
Barley.....	8.64	10.0	32. 0.0	8a.0r.11p.	3. 4.0
Oats.....	8.39	9.2	17.16.8	4a.3r.20p.	1.15.8
Peas.....	4.22	13.6	14.17.0	5a.2r.19p.	1.19.8¼
Nonsuch.....	30.	3.0	6. 6.0	1a.1r.27p.	12.7¼
Turnips at £2 an acre.....			16. 0.0	8a.0r. 0p.	1.12 0
6 cows at £7.....			42. 0.0		4. 4.0
30 sheep at 1/6.10 lambs at 6/.....			5. 5.0		10.6
Geese, pigs, etc., none.....					
Young stock, one at £1.....					2.0
					£17.18.5¼

The latter, it will be recollected, could not be made subject to tithe, yet we find Mr. Edwards paying 4s. for a dog and 24s. for 4 horses.

In spite of the burden of tithes and taxes and the addition of considerable consumer goods taxation, there is no evidence of ill feeling existing between the vicar and tithe payers and only much

later, in 1824, after Mr. Smith's time, is there a hint of a dispute between the incumbent and the parishioners and then it is not the tithepayers but the very poor of the parish who insisted on camping on a piece of land belonging to the vicar and they speedily renounced their "right" thereto after firm action had been taken against them.

## REPORT OF THE FOREST RESOURCES OF SPANISH EAST FLORIDA IN 1792

RICHARD K. MURDOCH

*Department of History, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh*

On September 24, 1792, the governor of East Florida, Juan Nepomuceno de Quesada, dispatched a most interesting report, to his immediate superior, Luis de Las Casas, governor-general of Cuba. The report was entitled, "Account of different trees observed in this province . . .,"<sup>1</sup> and appended to it were a number of additional documents and a covering letter. Exactly eight months earlier, January 24, 1792, the governor-general had written to Quesada to explain the terms of an accompanying Royal Order addressed to all subordinate commands of the Spanish colonial empire. Las Casas had written that it was the desire of the Spanish government that all commanders in the New World gather and forward to Madrid, by the chain of command, certain specific information concerning the arboreal flora of the portions of the Empire under their respective jurisdictions. Each reporting official, Las Casas had directed, was to reply "with an enumerated account that explains the names, uses and height

of the trees, the known qualities and values, whether medicinal or in the use of the trees; also, if possible, some description of the most rare leaves and fruits . . ."<sup>2</sup> He had also suggested that since the governor would not be conversant with such botanical and commercial data, most of the information could be derived from consultation with "the experienced denizens of these wooded area."<sup>3</sup> This information should be collected with the greatest possible dispatch.

The correspondence between Las Casas and Quesada does not indicate the purpose of the request. It may have been part of a scheme to locate new sources of revenue for the Crown or to make available additional quantities of food and raw materials for an empire that was not able to supply itself. Both possibilities seem to be logical in view of the data requested. As far as Las Casas was concerned, this information was to be used as part of his broad scheme to put the province of East Florida on a paying basis.

From the date of the retrocession of the province by England in 1783,<sup>4</sup> annual deficits had been mount-

<sup>1</sup> The Spanish original, entitled, *Relacion de diferentes Arboles conocidos en esta Provincia . . .*, enclosed in Quesada to Las Casas, September 24, 1792, is located in the East Florida Papers, box 23 J2, in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. The East Florida Papers will be referred to henceforth as EF.

<sup>2</sup> Las Casas to Quesada, January 24, 1792, as quoted in Quesada to Las Casas, March 9, 1792, EF b23 J2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Florida was ceded to England by Spain in 1763 by

ing; by 1790 they had become quite alarming. The province was unable to meet even its minimum food and material requirements. Commodities which should have been produced locally were being imported from Cuba, or, after the importation restrictions were relaxed in 1790, at great expense and labor from the United States. The problem of underproduction and overconsumption was made more annoying by the recollection that during at least a portion of the twenty years of English administration, East Florida had been a source of considerable revenue to the English Crown. Under English rule, the local population had raised large crops of grain, tended growing herds of cattle, felled large amounts of timber of several varieties, and produced a fair amount of ships' stores for the Royal Navy. In many ways, East Florida had proven itself to be capable of attaining a degree of economic self-sufficiency.<sup>5</sup> It must be pointed out, however, that this condition was largely due to a great increase in population during the period of English occupancy, an increase particularly noticeable in the number of agricultural workers and in the group of small merchants.

With the return of the province to Spain in 1783, at least 90 per cent of the English residents of East Florida left their new homes and found shelter in other parts of the English colonial empire, or in the British Isles.<sup>6</sup> Those who remained, a mere handful of people, were by no means all of Spanish blood. A small group of English settlers, many of them plantation owners, remained behind to salvage some of the basic value of their property holdings. These settlers, however, were not of the laboring class, nor did they have enough agricultural labor to produce sufficient food for the large Spanish garrison at Fort San Marcos in St. Augustine. The combination of upkeep of the fort, the salaries of the military garrison, and the purchase of victuals and supplies soon emptied

the meager treasury in St. Augustine.<sup>7</sup> The annual deficits encountered after 1783 were paid off by a *situado* or subsidy grant drawn from the already heavily burdened treasury of the province of New Spain.<sup>8</sup> Additional grants were frequently requested of the governor-general in Havana. The number and frequency of these requests prompted Las Casas to propose a project which he hoped might lead to the partial rehabilitation of the finances of East Florida. Any method of increasing the annual revenue of the province by the sale of raw materials, or by increased agricultural output, would aid in achieving this end.

The problem of increasing the output of the few farms still under cultivation, and the re-planting of areas formerly cultivated by the English settlers, had been under serious consideration earlier both in St. Augustine and in Havana. As a result of several reports by the East Florida officials, it was decided in 1790 to relax the strict laws against foreign settlement in the Spanish colonies to the extent of permitting certain carefully chosen agricultural families to settle along the St. Johns River on the plantations which had been abandoned in 1783 and 1784. It was hoped that this increase in farm population would be accompanied by a corresponding increase in agricultural production. The influx of settlers, many from Georgia and South Carolina, was at first quite gratifying. Soon, however, the situation became alarming as the quantity increased and the quality decreased, at least according to Spanish standards. Apparently Las Casas hoped to discover additional local raw materials which could be exploited by the new settlers.

Soon after the receipt of the governor-general's letter of January 24,<sup>9</sup> Governor Quesada sent a questionnaire to eight local residents, seeking their aid in fulfilling the King's request for botanical information.<sup>10</sup> These men, with one exception, had been residents of East Florida during the period

<sup>7</sup> A discouraging report of the state of the finances of the province is to be found in Céspedes to Bernardo de Gálvez, July 29, 1785, EF b40.

<sup>8</sup> For some figures on the *situado*, see Clarence H. Haring, *The Spanish Empire in America* (New York, 1947), 305.

<sup>9</sup> This letter was acknowledged in Quesada to Las Casas, March 9, 1792, EF b23 J2.

<sup>10</sup> These letters were sent to John MacQueen, Francisco Felipe Fatio, Andrew Atkinson, Thomas Sterling, John MacIntosh, Richard Lang, Francisco Xavier Sanchez and William Pengree.

the terms of the Treaty of Paris. It was retroceded in 1783 by the Treaty of Versailles.

<sup>5</sup> For a brief summary of the economic conditions of East Florida during the English period, see "Description of East Florida," (March 18) 1785, enclosed in Céspedes to Conde de Gálvez, March 18, 1785, EF b40.

<sup>6</sup> For an account of the departure of the English, see Wilbur H. Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida, 1774-1785* (2 vols., Deland, Florida, 1929), 1, Chapters 10-11.



of English occupation. All were respected citizens with homes and properties located in the general region of the St. Johns River. The replies of only four are at hand, and in only two of these four cases are the lists of trees and their uses available.<sup>11</sup> The governor stressed the need for both speed and accuracy in drawing up these lists, but nearly three months elapsed before any information was forwarded to St. Augustine. All had excuses for the delay and meagerness of their replies: the writer was either entirely too ignorant of such things, or was entirely too busy taking care of his properties. One writer plead ill health, too much pressing personal business, and a general lack of knowledge of the use to which forest products might be put. It is difficult to believe that frontier settlers could live in close association with the soil and still profess to know so little about its products.

It is likely that Quesada received reports from the other four settlers since two and one half months elapsed between the time the last known list reached St. Augustine and the governor submitted his final report to Havana. On the other hand, he may have taken a great deal of time to check the incoming reports, one against the other, to insure the accuracy of his cumulative report. This final report contained considerable pertinent information of a fairly accurate nature, as well as a certain amount of questionable value. Strangely enough the governor failed to mention by name all the varieties of trees that appeared in the lists prepared by the two settlers. No reason can be advanced for this omission unless it resulted from the conflicting observations made by the two writers. In preparing his final report for Las Casas, Quesada employed a number of names of local origin to identify various trees. Obviously he was influenced by local usage rather than by botanical knowledge. As a matter of fact, he had stressed his scanty knowledge of things botanical in his letters to Havana, hoping that this would be taken into consideration if his report should be found to contain inaccuracies in terminology. The use of names of local origin makes it difficult to be certain at times just which variety of tree is being described. The governor made no use of the Latin

botanical names which Linnaeus had recently introduced.<sup>12</sup>

In his covering letter Quesada expressed regret that the King's vassals did not seem to take a lively interest in preparing their reports. Copies of all his correspondence with various East Florida residents in reference to the matter of complying with the Royal Order was appended to the report. A translation of the report follows.

Account of different trees observed in this province which stretches from the Mosquitos River to the St. Marys River; and the purpose for which they are used; but as the vast territory lying between the first named river and the Gulf of Mexico is unpopulated and unexplored, it is known only that this region produces in general those [trees] which are peculiar to the Tropic of Cancer.

1. The live-oak [*Quercus virginiana*] or Carrasco is preferred in construction of vessels because of its strength; the bark of this tree is most superior in tanning hides; these trees are found in dense thickets in this province; their trunks are from 30 to 40 feet in height and from 14 to 16 feet in circumference.

2. The white-oak [*Tecoma pentophylla*] is the tree held in the greatest esteem by the coopers because of its strength; the cartwrights likewise prefer it for general use as hubs and spokes; this wood should be seasoned in a covered location as it is disposed to split; this tree is found in thick woods, and at the ground, grows up to 8 feet in circumference, and it is 30 feet in height; it is rather scarce in the province because of the extensive harvesting of it that was carried on during the time of British government and of the evacuation of this country.

3. The water-oak [*Quercus aquatica*] is also used by the coopers for the same purpose; but its wood is not of the same resistance as the aforementioned; it is also used for handspikes; this tree is very plentiful in the province; its central trunk is from 30 to 40 feet in height and 7 to 8 in circumference.

4. The ash [*Fraxinus americana* or *F. pennsylvanica*] is a soft wood which is used considerably for shafts of four-wheeled carts and for Volantas

<sup>11</sup> Only the lists sent in by Atkinson and MacIntosh are available, although the governor specifically mentioned the receipt of lists prepared by Sanchez and Fatio.

<sup>12</sup> An attempt will be made to identify each tree as mentioned by Quesada with the species most likely to be found in the East Florida region. The Latin names will be included in each case.

as well as for oars of boats;<sup>13</sup> the country people boil the bark of this tree and drink the liquid to rid themselves of internal fevers; the trees are very common in deep thickets in this province; they grow from 6 to 7 feet in circumference and from 40 to 50 feet in height.

5. The sweet gum [*Liquidambar styraciflua*]<sup>14</sup> is found in elevated areas in dense woods; it is a wood that rots easily; the bark of this tree emits a pungent gum which, in the opinion of some, is fragrant, and, of some, disgusting; the country people make a salve of this gum to cure ulcers; it is a very common tree with a maximum circumference of from 7 to 9 feet, and of from 30 to 40 feet in height.

6. There is another tree similar to this one; the only difference being in the leaves and black gum; it is used by the cartwrights considerably for the hubs of every variety of wheel; the gum of the aforementioned tree is of unknown quality; it is of the same height and thickness.<sup>15</sup>

7. The red bay [*Persea barbonia*]<sup>16</sup> is of a fiery color; it is used for wheels, frames of windows and doors, and also for the straight planks of vessels; it is especially rare in the province because of the extensive harvesting during the time of the British government and the evacuation of the country; this tree is found from 3 to 4 feet in circumference and its trunk is from 10 to 15 feet in height; when it reaches this size, it is usually found to be hollow.

8. The cherry [*Prunus caroliniana*]<sup>17</sup> is a tree of the same height and circumference; the wood of this tree has a yellow tinge and is used for Volantas and wheels; it is very shiny when fresh and has a tendency to water when worked; it is and has always been very rare.

9. The persimmon [*Diospyros virginiana*] is a tree very common in tropical lands; it has a fruit which is very sweet when in season, but which cannot be bitten into when not ripe as it puckers the mouth; there is no particular use for its wood; the brownish peel is baked and then taken with water by the country people for *tenesmus*.

10. The sabine [*Juniperus barbadensis*], other-

wise the cedar, is red and very shiny when freshly cut; it has a firm quality and is used considerably for vessels, timbers for houses, and for doors and windows; it can be turned on the lathe; wheels are also made of it; it is also used in the same manner for the inside finishing of bureaus and writing desks; those who are acquainted with this wood say that cockroaches cannot stand the scent; because of this scent, a great deal has been harvested, but no doubt when the head of the St. Johns River is reached, a sufficient amount will be found; this tree is found from 4 to 5 feet in circumference and from 25 to 30 feet in height; the branches of this tree are so shaped as never to give sufficient straight wood for ships knees.

11. The cypress [*Taxodium distichum*]<sup>18</sup> is the tree with the least use although the most abundant in the province; it is larger than all trees in circumference and height; it is found in the dense and thick woods, from 18 to 20 feet in circumference and from 50 to 60 feet in a straight trunk; there is little use for it other than for shingles, although those with experience prefer it to all woods; it is difficult to cut this wood since it can be done only in dry times as the tree grows in overflowed places; this wood is hard to cut and especially heavy when green; but when dry it is lighter and harder than before; it is used for all joints in house-building, for various kinds of roofing, and, generally, for all types of carpentry with the exception of flooring; the color of this wood shades toward yellow; an old inhabitant, Don Francisco Xavier Sanchez, affirms that he prefers this wood to all others because it happened that three years after the Spanish government took possession of this Plaza, he was compelled to demolish a house which he had purchased at the time of the English evacuation; in this house, he found several roof beams of this wood covered by a false roof which were as good as the first day they were put in; it was discovered that this house was one of the oldest in the town, and, in the opinion of this same Don Francisco, from what he recalls having heard from the former owners, it was over 200 years old.

12. The pine [*Pinus palustris*]<sup>19</sup> is an especially abundant tree in all parts of the province both in high and low places; it is a wood made much use of in building houses and for masts of vessels, but it

<sup>13</sup> The volanta is a two-wheeled cart common to Cuba.

<sup>14</sup> This tree may be the liquid-ambar or alligator tree.

<sup>15</sup> This tree may be the tupelo (*Nyssa aquatica*).

<sup>16</sup> This tree is also called the American laurel or Florida mahogany.

<sup>17</sup> This reference is probably to the wild black cherry.

<sup>18</sup> This tree is probably the bald or deciduous cypress.

<sup>19</sup> This tree is probably the yellow or long-leaf pine.

is preferable to cypress for flooring only if stripped of dried bark; the height of these pines is found to run between 40 and 50 feet, and their circumference, although not often in sizes up to 8 feet, usually is about 4 feet; the bark of this tree is brown; the bark on the trunk tends to be rough as in shells; when these trees are green, a resin drips from the bark which dries and remains stuck to the tree; this resin is sometimes put in a flask with brandy and the spirit of the tamarack; this colored liquid taken in a wine-glass morning and night, has caused relief in two or three months to those subjects who feared themselves to be in a consumptive state; a few drops of this liquid put in a glass of water turns the water white in the same

manner as a few drops of Inglesas de Turlington; the British extracted huge quantities of turpentine, liquid pitch and tar from this pine.

I make no further mention of many more mediocre trees lacking facts about them and their value.

The orange [*Citrus aurantium*], both bitter and sweet, is abundant, and the British used the fruit of various types; there was a specially lucrative trade in the bitter orange with the British colonies, where in nearby Georgia, there did not exist enough to satisfy the demand.

*San Agustin de la Florida,*  
24 September, 1792.

## NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

## NEW BOOKS ON AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

E. M. Pittenger, who compiled the accompanying list of new books on agricultural history, is the librarian of the College of Agriculture Library at the University of Wisconsin. If members of the Society find the bibliography useful, it is proposed to publish such a list annually.

## BOOKS ON AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Published in 1952

Compiled by

E. M. PITTENDER

BROOKS, JEROME E. *The Mighty Leaf: Tobacco Through the Centuries*. Boston, Little, Brown. 1952. 361 p. \$5.00.

CASSELMAN, PAUL HUBERT. *The Cooperative Movement and Some of Its Problems*. New York, Philosophical Library. 1952. 178 p. \$3.00.

CAVANAGH, HELEN M. *Funk of Funk's Grove: Farmer, Legislator and Cattle King of the Old Northwest, 1797-1865*. Bloomington, Illinois, Pantagraph Printing Company. 1952. 208 p. \$3.50.

CHAMBERS, CLARKE A. *California Farm Organizations: A Historical Study of the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the Associated Farmers, 1929-1941*. Berkeley, University of California Press. 1952. 277 p. \$3.75.

CHILDS, MARQUIS W. *The Farmer Takes a Hand: The Electric Power Revolution in Rural America*. Garden City, N. Y. Doubleday. 1952. 256 p. \$3.50.

CIRIACY-WANTRUP, SIEGFRIED VON. *Resource Conservation: Economics and Policies*. Berkeley, University of California Press. 1952. 395 p. \$6.50.

CLELAND, ROBERT GLASS. *The Irvine Ranch of Orange County, 1810-1950*. San Marino, California, Huntington Library. 1952. 163 p. \$3.50.

CLEMENT, WILLIAM E. and LANDRY, STUART O. *Plantation Life on the Mississippi*. New Orleans, Pelican Publishing Company. 1952. 212 p. \$3.75.

DOBIE, J. FRANK. *The Mustangs*. Boston, Little, Brown. 1952. 376 p. \$6.00.

FEIERABEND, LADISLAV. *Agricultural Cooperatives in Czechoslovakia*. New York, Mid-European Studies Center. 1952. 125 p. \$1.00.

FINLEY, MOSES I. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C.: The Horos-Inscriptions*. New Brunswick, N. J. Rutgers University Press. 1952. 332 p. \$3.50.

FRANKLIN, T. BEDFORD. *A History of Scottish Farming*. Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1952. 194 p. 12s 6d.

FRYDE, MATTHEW M. *Selected Works on Polish Agrarian History and Agriculture: A Bibliographical Survey*. New York, Mid-European Studies Center. 1952. 87 p. \$5.00.

FUSSELL, GEORGE E. *The Farmer's Tools, 1500-1900: The History of British Farm Implements, Tools and Machinery before the Tractor Came*. London, Melrose. 1952. 42s.

GLOVER, WILBUR H. *Farm and College: The College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin: A History*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press. 1952. 462 p. \$5.00.

GRANOVSKY, ABRAHAM. *The Land System in Palestine: History and Structure*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1952. 359 p. 21s.

GREGG, KATE L., ed. *The Santa Fe: The Journal and Diaries of George Champlin Sibley and Others Pertaining to the Surveying and Marking of a Road from the Missouri Frontier to the Settlements of New Mexico, 1825-1827*. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press. 1952. 280 p. \$4.50.

- HANDLEY, J. E. *Scottish Farming in the Eighteenth Century*. London, Faber and Faber. 1953. 314 p. 25s.
- HARDIN, CHARLES M. *The Politics of American Agriculture: Soil Conservation and the Struggle for Power in Rural America*. Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press. 1952. 282 p. \$4.00.
- HALL, ISAAC H. *Built of Men: The Story of Indiana Cooperatives*. New York, Harper. 1952. 212 p. \$3.00.
- HUNTER, DARD. *Papermaking in Pioneer America*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press. 1952. 178 p. \$6.50.
- HYAMS, E. S. *Soil and Civilisation*. London, Thames and Hudson. 1952. 312 p. \$4.50.
- JACKSON, W. TURRENTINE. *Wagon Roads West: A Study of Federal Road Surveys and Construction in the Trans-Mississippi West, 1846-1869*. Berkeley University of California Press. 1952. 422 p. \$5.00.
- LINDEMANS, P. *Geschiedenis van de landbouw in België*. Pts. 1 & 2. Antwerpen, De Sikkel. 1952.
- MACEWAN, GRANT. *Between the Red and the Rockies*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press. 1952. 300 p. \$3.50.
- MACGIBBON, D. A. *The Canadian Grain Trade, 1931-1951*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press. 1952. 227 p. \$4.50.
- MCNALL, N. A. *Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley, 1790-1860*. Philadelphia, American Historical Association. 1952. 276 p. \$5.00.
- MANGUM, CHARLES S., JR. *The Legal Status of the Tenant Farmer in the Southeast*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press. 1952. 478 p. \$7.50.
- MASSEY, MARY ELIZABETH. *Ersatz in the Confederacy*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press. 1952. 233 p. \$5.00.
- MASTERSON, V. V. *The Katy Railroad and the Last Frontier*. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press. 1952. 312 p. \$4.00.
- NELSON, LOWRY. *The Mormon Village: A Pattern and Technique of Land Settlement*. Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press. 1952. 313 p. \$5.00.
- PAPADAKIS, JOHN. *Agricultural Geography of the World*. Buenos Aires, Argentina, The author. 1952. 131 p. \$60.00.
- PARKS, W. ROBERT. *Soil Conservation Districts in Action*. Ames, Iowa State College Press. 1952. 253 p. \$3.00.
- PATEL, SURENDRA. *Agricultural Labourers in Modern India and Pakistan*. Bombay, Current Book House. 1952. 169 p.
- Philippine Republic. Bureau of Agriculture. Golden Jubilee Committee. *A Half-Century of Philippine Agriculture*, written by men of the Bureau of Agriculture, the Bureau of Plant Industry, the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Fiber Inspection Service. Manila, Graphic House. 1952. 463 p.
- RODGERS, ANDREW DENNY, III. *Erwin Frink Smith: A Story of North American Plant Pathology*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 31. Philadelphia, The Society. 1952. 675 p. \$5.00.
- SAUER, C. O. *Agricultural Origins and Dispersals*. Bowman Memorial Lectures, Series 2. New York, American Geographical Society, 1952. 110 p. \$4.00.
- SCOTT, JAMES CAMERON. *Health and Agriculture in China: A Fundamental Approach to Some of the Problems of World Hunger*. London, Faber and Faber. 1952. 279 p. 35s.
- SIM, MARY B. *Commercial Canning in New Jersey: History and Early Development*. Trenton, New Jersey Agricultural Society. 1952. 510 p. \$7.00.
- SIMPSON, LESLIE B. *Exploitation of Land in Central Mexico in the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley, University of California Press. 1952. 92 p. \$1.50.
- SPENCER, J. E. *Land and People in the Philippines*. Berkeley, University of California Press. 1952. 282 p. \$4.50.
- STORCK, JOHN AND TEAGUE, W. D. *Flour for Man's Bread: A History of Milling*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press. 1952. 382 p. \$7.50.
- TAYLOR, HENRY C. and TAYLOR, ANNE D. *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932: Men, Services, Ideas*. Ames, Iowa State College Press. 1952. 1121 p. \$10.00.
- TROUTON, RUTH. *Peasant Renaissance in Yugoslavia, 1900-1950: A Study of the Development of Yugoslav Peasant Society as Affected by Education*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1952. 344 p. 28s.
- WAGONER, JUNIOR J. *History of the Cattle Industry in Southern Arizona, 1540-1940*. Tucson, University of Arizona Press. 1952. 132 p. \$1.25.
- WEBB, WALTER PRESCOTT. *The Great Frontier*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin. 1952. 434 p. \$5.00.

#### JOINT SESSION WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Andrew H. Clark and Herbert A. Kellar have arranged a joint session with the American Historical Association for the December meeting in Chicago to consider the subject of plantation labor systems. The following papers will be presented: Paul S. Taylor, University of California, Berkeley, "Plantation Labor Systems of North America from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century"; Albert V. House, Harpur College, State University of New York, "Labor Management Problems on Georgia Rice Plantations, 1840-1860"; Bennett H. Wall, University of Kentucky, "Appraisal of the Value of Plantation Labor in the Ante-Bellum South"; and Karl J. Pelzer, Yale University, "History of Plantation Labor in Southeast



Asia." Edwin A. Davis, Louisiana State University, will discuss the papers, and Herbert A. Kellar will serve as chairman of the meeting. This session is scheduled for December 30, 10:00 A.M.

A joint luncheon has been arranged for 12:30 the same day, with an address by Hubert G. Schmidt, Newark College on "Post War Trends in West German Agriculture." Colonel Edward N. Wentworth will serve as chairman of the luncheon meeting.

## EDWARD E. EDWARDS MEMORIAL AWARD COMMITTEE

The President of the Society, Edward N. Wentworth, has announced the appointment of the following persons to the Everett E. Edwards Memorial Award Committee: William B. Hesseltine, (Chairman), Howard Hyman Goldin, and Bennett H. Wall. The editor will be a member ex-officio. The first awards will be made for articles appearing in *Agricultural History* during the year 1953.